

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 58, St. Albans Road, Edinburgh.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management :

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., Chairman.

Prof. R. S. GONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A.
Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A.
Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A.
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.
(Hon. Treasurer).

With the Chairman,
representing the Council
of the Classical
Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary), representing
the Oxford Philological Society.

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., representing the
Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University.

Vol. XLVI

NOVEMBER, 1932

No. 5

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
TO AESCHYLUS. W. H.	193	REVIEWS (continued):	
REVUE DES ÉTUDES HOMÉRIQUES. A. S. . . .	193	<i>Alexander the Great</i> (Wilcken); <i>The Ephe-</i>	
HESIOD'S PANDORA. S. M. ADAMS	193	<i>merides of Alexander's Expedition</i> (Robin-	
EURIPIDES' <i>Andromache</i> 1037-46, <i>Troades</i>		son). W. W. TARN	216
380-1. A. Y. CAMPBELL	196	<i>A History of the Greek World from 323 to</i>	
VIRGIL, <i>Georgics</i> II. 39-45. J. W. MACKAIL . .	199	146 B.C. (Cary). W. W. TARN	217
VERGIL AND OCTAVIAN. R. S. CONWAY . .	199	<i>The History of World Civilisation</i> (Schneider):	
TYRAION AGAIN. W. M. RAMSAY	203	A. W. GOMME	218
METPA ΘΑΛΑΣΣΗΣ AND ΚΤΜΑΤΑ ΜΕ-		<i>Le Mura di Roma repubblicana</i> (Säflund).	
ΤΕΙΝ. A. Y. CAMPBELL	203	R. GARDNER	220
ONCE MORE AESCHYLUS, <i>Septem</i> , 13-12. H. J.		<i>The Miniatures of the Manuscripts of Terence</i>	
ROSE	203	<i>prior to the Thirteenth Century</i> (Jones and	
REVIEWS:		Morey). J. D. CRAIG	221
<i>The Odyssey translated into Verse</i> (Mackail).		<i>Luhrez: Seine Gestalt in seinem Gedicht</i>	
E. S. FORSTER	203	(Regenbogen). J. D. DUFF	223
<i>Elegy and Iambus</i> (Edmonds). C. M. BOWRA		<i>Horazens Epistel über die Dichtkunst</i> (Im-	
<i>The Works of Pindar</i> , II, III (Farnell).		misch). J. WIGHT DUFF	223
D. S. ROBERTSON	205	<i>The Divinity of the Roman Emperor</i> (Taylor).	
<i>De Euripidis fabula quae Daëmon inscribitur</i>		M. P. CHARLESWORTH	225
(Volmer). G. MURRAY	208	<i>Das geographische Bild des alten Italien in</i>	
<i>Xenophontis Expeditio Cyri</i> (Hude); <i>Xéno-</i>		<i>Vergils Aeneis</i> (Rehm). M. PLATNAUER	
<i>phon, Anabase</i> , T. II (Masqueray). E. C.		<i>Vergil in the Experience of South Africa</i>	
MARCHANT	209	(Haarhoff). R. S. CONWAY	227
<i>German Works on Greek Philosophy</i> . D.		<i>Esegesi Virgiliana Antica</i> (Funaioli). J. D.	
TARRANT	210	CRAIG	228
<i>The Platonic Epistles</i> (Harward). R. HACK-		<i>Stilistische Studien zur Erweiterung der Satz-</i>	
FORTH	212	<i>glieder im Lateinischen</i> (Lindholm). P. S.	
<i>Demosthenis Orationes</i> , T. III (Rennie). A. N.		NOBLE	229
BRYAN-BROWN	213	<i>Gott und Hölle</i> (Kroll). H. J. ROSE . .	230
<i>Lycurgue, contre Léocrate et Fragments</i> (Durr-		SHORT REVIEWS	231
bach). E. S. FORSTER	215	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	238
		BOOKS RECEIVED	240

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 2s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr F. C. G. Langford, 35, Alleyn Park, Dulwich, S.E. 21. Inquiries should be sent to The Triangle Offices, 61, South Molton Street, W. 1, addressed either to the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Miss E. C. Gedge and Mr. R. M. Rattenbury) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

The Loeb Classical Library

EDITED BY

T. E. PAGE, LITT.D.

E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.

W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

Each volume, Foolscap 8vo, 400–600 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net.
Leather, 12s. 6d. net.

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

NEW BOOKS READY, Autumn, 1932

Greek

264. *Aristotle*. POLITICS. Translated by H. RACKHAM.
265. *Eusebius*. THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. In two vols. Vol. II. Translated by E. L. OULTON.
266. *Select Papyri*. In two vols. Vol. I. Translated by A. S. HUNT and C. C. EDGAR.

Latin

263. *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. In three vols. Vol. III. Translated by D. MAGIE.

Ready Shortly.

- 63 & 64. *Virgil*. Translated by H. R. FAIRCLOUGH. New and revised edition.

Descriptive Prospectus giving particulars of the volumes already published and those in preparation will be sent free on application to the publishers.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

and
upon
onal
) to
reate

annual
t 5s.
lings
sical
sical
the
y be

Mr
nt to
Hon.
or to
ryth,
eeds,
orth
tern,

y

ite
re,

ed
nd

by

n.
in

O
Sp
Ea

W
M
L
O
T

Q
w
i
w
p
st
st

o
se
a
a
h

n
T
C
a
h
h
t
t

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1932

ὦ βαθύφρον φῶνιμα, βροτοῖς διὰ παντὸς ἐναυλον,
ὦ Μαραθωνομάχῃ χειρὶ συνηριοχῶν
οἰκτον ἐπιχθόνιον, σέβας οὐράνιον, δέος Ἄιδου,
θαῦμα καὶ ἀγλαῖαν σὺν τε φόβῳ χάριτας,
Ἀισχύλῃ, νῦν σοὶ τήνδε φέρω χάριν· ἀλλὰ σὺ δέξαι·
εἰ δ' ἄρα μὴ χαίρειν ἔστιν ἀποχοιμένοισι,
ἀλλὰ καὶ οὐ φρονέοντι θέλω μετὰ δούρο φυνεύσας
πλέγμα παρ' οἰκείων ἀντιθέσθαι στεφάνων.

W. H.

O deep-souled Music in the world's wide ear,
Splendour and wonder and delight and fear,
Earth, Heaven, and Hell, strange, pitiable or
grand,

Wielder of all with Marathonian hand,
May this late homage please; or if the past
Lose pleasure, yet before thy fame I cast
One devout wreath of laurels alien-grown,
These alien laurels, offspring of thine own.

W. HEADLAM.

We owe these verses to Mr. Robert Quirk of Winchester, who writes: 'He wrote them out for me some time in 1903 or 1904, saying, "You can guess which I wrote first." Over the latter part of the third line of the English stood the alternative words 'sublime, strange, piteous, grand.'

Many of those interested in the study of the Greek epic have long wished to see a journal devoted to the subject, and they can now welcome the *fait accompli*. A *Revue des Études homériques* has been founded by M. Charles Vellay,

editor of *L'Acropole*, and will be both published and edited by himself. His qualifications for the work are well known to anyone familiar with his Homeric writings.

It will now be the pleasure and duty of every Homerist, be he a strenuous Homeromastix, a mere Unitarian, an Enucleator, a Rearranger, ἢ ὅστις δῆποτε χαίρει ὀνομαζόμενος, to help M. Vellay by contributing Homeric matter and supplying him with copies of his works and essays for review or notice. The first issue of the periodical contains three original papers, one a full discussion by M. Pierre Waltz of the *τροπὰὶ ἡελίοιο* of ο 414, and two by M. Vellay himself on the site of Troy, a subject on which he has recently written much and with much effect. In addition a large number of works are catalogued and reviewed. It seems that subscribers will find in the pages a full and continuous bibliography that will be very helpful to the student of the poems. All success to the enterprise so generously undertaken!

The *Revue* is for the present to be published once a year at 45, Boulevard Beaumarchais, Paris (III^e), and the subscription to residents outside France is 25 francs.

A. S.

HESIOD'S PANDORA.

ἀνέμνηε δὲ τήνδε γυναῖκα
Πανδῶρην διὰ πάντες Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
δῶρον ἐδώρυσαν πῆμ' ἀνδράσιν ἀλφειστήσιν.
Erga 80-82.

It is reasonably certain that this is a new explanation of the name Pandora. The original Pandora is undoubtedly Ge, who πάντα τὰ πρὸς τὸ ζῆν δωρεῖται, as the Scholiast writes on Aristophanes *Aves* 971, where the comic poet evidently has this Hesiodic identification in mind.¹ Pandora the All-giver is thus trans-

formed by Hesiod into Pandora the All-gifted. She loses her primitive majesty as the great sustainer of life and becomes the medium through whom the Olympians at the bidding of Zeus set evils on earth; and we appear to have before us an attempt to find a place for the ancient Earth-worship in the religion of Olympus. In a sense Hesiod thus anticipates Aeschylus.² At any

¹ He has been steeping himself in Hesiod for the purposes of his parabasis, vv. 685 ff., and the 'Goddess of Beggary' is a by-product.

NO. CCCXL. VOL. XLVI.

² It is of interest that Aeschylus in his own treatment of the Prometheus-story makes an equally explicit identification of Gaia to suit his purpose: she is Themis, πολλῶν ὀνομάτων μορφή μία (*P. V.* 212).

rate, we should see in Hesiod's Prometheus-Pandora story not 'legends already contaminated' set forth by a poet chargeable with 'gaucherie' and 'rusticité',¹ but an attempt to harmonise conflicting trends of religious thought in Part One of an Essay on the Life of Man. If we recognise this, we may be tolerant of the confusion very logically demonstrated by Mr. Gow.²

The plan of the first 105 verses of the *Works and Days* is drastically simple. After the customary invocation of the Muses the poet addresses himself to Zeus as the ultimate authority over that existence which he proposes first to explain and then to describe. He passes to the outstanding subject of Eris. There is Struggle in man's world, for good and evil, justice and injustice: evil Struggle increases war and contentiousness, while the Struggle which is good prompts a man to just and honest toil. This leads directly to the inevitable questions, Why must man toil to win his daily bread? and Why do evils exist in the world? These questions the stories of Prometheus and Pandora are designed to answer.

The origin of toil is briefly enough given (vv. 42-58). At one time men knew neither evils nor toil; but Prometheus tricked Zeus, and Zeus therefore hid the sustenance of life, so that man must toil to find it in the earth or in the sea. To link this origin to that of evils, the tale proceeds: Zeus hid not only βίος but also πῦρ. Prometheus, however, stole Fire again for man's use; and to offset this Zeus declared that he would give humankind an evil thing which they would be glad to accept, thereby embracing their own doom. From this point the story becomes that of Pandora and serves to explain the creation of evils (which had not, like βίος, previously existed) and the manner of their dissemination.³

¹ Thus P. Girard describes it, *Rev. d. Et. gr.* xxii, pp. 217 ff.

² A. S. F. Gow, in *Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway*, pp. 99 ff., finding a combination of a 'Misogynist's Myth' and a πῖθος-myth, neither story being intact in itself.

³ I see no reason to deny that this tale of Prometheus is what we are pleased to call allegory. In the first place, Prometheus, whatever the etymology of the word, is that which

Our version has already differed notably from that given in the *Theogony*: in the latter poem there is no mention of βίος. It now differs even more strikingly. In the *Theogony* Zeus decrees the creation of the first woman, who is thereupon made by Hephaestus and adorned by Pallas Athene: woman herself is the destined evil, a 'sheer delusion.' But in the *Works and Days* there is no reference to a 'first woman': the identification noted is in fact a double identification, for the 'first woman' of the *Theogony* and Ge herself are merged in this new Pandora; and 'Pandora' is not herself 'the evil,' but acts as the agent of Zeus. Again, while Hephaestus is still the fashioner of the lovely maiden, Zeus here commands the services of Aphrodite and Hermes as well as those of Athene, and in the ensuing description the Graces, Peitho and the Seasons are found sharing in the work, whereas Aphrodite is not again mentioned. In explanation of this elaborateness of detail I suggest that Hesiod is finding room amongst the Olympians, under the aegis of Zeus, both for Gaia-Pandora and for other powers who do not properly belong to the Olympian pantheon. It is a naive design. First the poet broadens the description to include additional recognised Olympians in the orders given by Zeus. With this preparation he inserts a selection of non-Olympian powers and,

differentiates man from the rest of the animal kingdom; he represents Man. This is implied in Hesiod's version: why, otherwise, should the punishment for Prometheus' trick be visited upon man as a matter of course? This loss of easy βίος precedes the theft; it is not *quid pro quo*. Secondly, Prometheus commonly represents civilisation. So Aeschylus interprets the σέλας πᾶντ' ἔχοντος πρῶτος (cf. *P. V.* 442 ff.); so also Protagoras understands it in that Dialogue. Here it is to counterbalance man's possession of fire (ἀντὶ πρῶτος, v. 57) that Zeus designs the πῆμα of evils after Prometheus' second offence, and this may conceivably mean that Hesiod sees a connection between civilisation and the evils of life. If there is no reference to fire as civilisation, that is because the poet wishes to show not the civilising of man but the origin of evils; this whole part of the poem is characterised by the rigid exclusion of all matter not directly pertinent to the simple design. That is why, for instance, the story of the tricking of Zeus, told at some length in the *Theogony*, is excluded from this work.

perhaps to suggest that all this is a generalisation, omits Aphrodite. At the end, when he has introduced 'Pandora,' he seals his effort with his πάντες 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες. He is offering a composite theology in which different lines of current religious thought may be brought into a kind of formal harmony with the worship of a supreme Zeus.

This process is continued. Pandora, minister of Zeus, is accepted by humankind in the person of Epimetheus.¹ She takes off the lid of a jar and the contents thereof, with the exception of Elpis, escape. It is a fair assumption that this πίθος-opening is an adaptation of ancient ritual or current legend or both. If we accept Miss Harrison's association of it with Pithoigia, the first of the three days of Anthesteria, 'when the πίθοι of the dead were opened and the souls let out,'² we shall believe that Hesiod is incorporating in his new theology the direr side of Chthonian worship. If, on the other hand, the story merely looks to the common use of πίθοι for the storing of produce, he is continuing to deal with Pandora the All-giver. In either case, instead of Miss Harrison's 'quaint conflict of theological systems' with Zeus 'taking over the creation of Pandora-Ge' we may discern an attempt (quaint indeed) at reconciliation; and the reconciliation is of course the easier through the two jars of Zeus described in *Iliad* xxiv.

Apart from the question of ritual, however, Hesiod's vague γυνή (v. 94) seems to point to the previous existence of the legend in other forms, necessitating careful phrasing. In its present context γυνή refers to Pandora; but there is nothing against Mr. Cornford's suggestion that 'in the earliest version there was no woman at all, but only Elpis.'³ Or the woman may have been in another version the 'first woman,' or woman in general, even as Babrius⁴ says that the lid was removed by man—

¹ Epimetheus is necessary, since all men do not manifest the quality of Prometheus. Prometheus could, and did, foresee the evil; yet evils exist; hence Epimetheus.

² *J.H.S.* xx, pp. 99 ff.

³ *Thucydides Mythistoricus*, pp. 493 ff.

⁴ *Fab.* lviii, where the jar contains τὰ χρηστὰ πάντα, and for which he may well have had ancient authority: see Gow, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-6.

ὁ ἀκρατὴς ἄνθρωπος. On any such assumption Hesiod's 'allusiveness' becomes essential. He wants a version formally comprehensive.

He is similarly circumspect with regard to the contents of the jar, though again his meaning is clear enough. Since it is the presence of evils on earth that he is explaining, and since evils have not previously existed on earth,⁵ there can be no reasonable doubt that, when the lid is removed, it is evils which escape to range over the earth, and not blessings that thus escape from man's grasp. What the jar contained according to other legends need not much concern us, and a contamination of legends here is altogether likely and, indeed, to be expected; but the nature of the present contents would probably never have been disputed but for the once current misconception of Elpis.

Apart from Hesychius' synonym προσδοκία, it is established that ἐλπίς and other similar 'emotions' do not possess in their own right any moral connotation, but derive moral significance from particular contexts. This is clearly Hesiod's point of view. Not only is there a good and a bad ἐλπίς (vv. 11 ff.); there is even a good and a bad αἰδώς (vv. 317-19). And Elpis itself is described (v. 500) as an evil 'when it attends upon a needy man': out of such situations, we know, comes θράσος, which leads to ἄτη. In this connection the inclusion of Peitho amongst the powers which adorn Pandora (v. 73) is very suggestive: here also Hesiod appears to anticipate Aeschylus, attaching the Peitho-Ate doctrine to Zeus.⁶

Elpis is thus happily placed. It serves Hesiod's present purpose, for it is classifiable as an evil; yet his version will not be in explicit disagreement with other versions telling of jars of blessings or jars of mingled blessings and evils.

⁵ Cf. vv. 90-1. (The mention of πόνος here is merely a recapitulation.)

⁶ Elpis has of course its good side; so, Theognis 1135. But the same poet can speak of it as a χαλεπὸς δαίμων (vv. 637-8). And Mr. Cornford has clearly shown that in Greek thought it is much more a dangerous passion than a virtue: *Thuc. Myth.*, pp. 167 ff. See also his note, *C.R.* xxi, pp. 228 ff., with a reference to Zielinski's theory that Elpis really belongs to the religion of Gaia.

But if *Elpis* is here an evil we must, as Mr. Gow points out, explain why it is singled out from the other evils, being kept within the jar. This we shall, I think, be able to do if we bear in mind that Hesiod is explaining the presence of evils, and admit that he is capable of a rough classification.¹ I take it that he is drawing a distinction between those evils for which man is himself at least partially responsible and those others which assail him for no ascertainable cause. The separate treatment is thus essential; for while the other evils escape from the jar and from man's control, that important class which man brings upon himself cannot be thus disseminated. *Elpis* is therefore brought into the poem (probably,

¹ Perceived by O. Gruppe (quoted by Girard, *op. cit.*, and rejected by Gow).

as Mr. Gow concludes, from the version told by Babrius): before it can escape from the jar the woman puts on the lid—*αἰγούχου βουλῇσι Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο*, a verse which, if an interpolation, is a singularly welcome one. Then comes mention of the other class, not unnaturally divided into two groups: (a) the *ἄλλα μυρία λυγρά* of vv. 100-1, which I would interpret as 'accidents'; and (b) the *νοῦσοι* of vv. 102-4, the word *αὐτόματοι* in v. 103 being especially significant in this connection.

There is, no doubt, some confusion of thought in the passage as a whole, but I submit that, whatever the sources from which it was drawn, it is substantially sound.

And suitably this part of the poem ends as it began, with a reference to Zeus.

S. M. ADAMS.

Trinity College, Toronto.

EURIPIDES' *ANDROMACHE* 1037-46, *TROADES* 380-1.

I.

οὐχὶ σοὶ μόνῃ
δόσφρονες ἐπέπεσον, οὐ φίλοισι, λῦπαι·
νόσον Ἑλλάς ἔτλα, νόσον διέβα δὲ Φρυγῶν
καὶ πρὸς εὐκάρπου γῆρας

1046 σκηπτὸς σταλάσσων τὸν Ἀἶδα φόνον.

THE first thing to surprise me was the τὸν; the article, even if pressed into a demonstrative, seemed mere padding. And padding sure enough it proved to be; not the poet's, but Hermann's, to plump out the metre. This has been the generally received text for well over a century.¹

But stranger still, what is Ἀἶδα φόνον, what is the blood of Hell? Hyslop refers to Soph. *O.C.* 1689 φόνιος Ἀΐδας; and Euripides himself employs the same expression, 'deadly Hades,' at *Alc.* 225. Now in English, doubtless, you could say that the thunder-cloud of war 'dripped death'; but who would think of hampering such a metaphor with the statement that this death was in some way or other associated with Death? In any case, however, the image in σκηπτὸς, the word σταλάσσω, and analogous expressions in Euripides, all combine to indicate that φόνος here

means—primarily at least—not death but blood; φόνον σταλαγμοί, drops of gore, *Hec.* 241; σταλαγμὸς αἵματος, *Ion.* 351, 1003. And not only is the expression thus complete without Ἀἶδα, but the fatuity of Ἀἶδα φόνον is amply demonstrated by the true character of the type of phrase thus misrepresented, a type of which examples are numerous.² Thus the Euripidean Ἀἶδον δράκαινα (*I.T.* 286), Ἀἶδον μάγειρος (*Cycl.* 397) are similar to our 'hell-cat' or 'hell-hound,' which indicate something expressly distinguished from any ordinary cat or dog. If our phrase had been of that category at all, what the poet would have written would have been (say) σταλάσσων ἔθ' Ἀἶδα ζάλην, a sleet of Hell, a rain of Death; compare φοινίλας ὑπὸ ζάλης Soph. *Al.* 351; and that I think he might well and appropriately have written here, only he obviously did not.

The context, on the other hand, shows that something requisite to the sense is missing.

² Headlam has assembled many in his note on Aesch. *Agam.* 1234, but has not fully recognised their principle; if he had he would neither have included our passage nor presented his collection as a defence of Ἀἶδον μητέρα.

¹ There are, however, numerous emendations, none credible, of αἶδα φόνον.

We must not think that νόσον in 1044 appropriates the emphasis because it is, by a Euripidean mannerism, repeated. The main emphasis is on Ἑλλάς. Not for you alone, O Trojan Andromache, has the aftermath of war proved bitter. Greece too has suffered, has suffered greatly; the storm-cloud that had so long brooded over Troy has since crossed the Aegean; it has lowered also above fields which the war had not ravaged; it has drizzled blood— We require a word which shall perform two functions. First, it must interpret to us the allusive phrase πρὸς εὐκάρπους γῆρας; that is to say, it must be the equivalent of 'upon the Greeks.' Second, it should provide a direct antithesis to Φρυγῶν; and that is to say, it must be 'upon the Greeks.' In the manuscript reading αἶδα I recognise the remnant of δαναΐδαις. Euripides wrote here σκηπτὸς σταλάσσων Δαναΐδαις φόνον, just as at *Hel.* 239 he wrote Κύπρις Δαναΐδαις ἄγρουσα θάνατον. The metre is cretic, in which ~~~ is very common; and for ~ antistrophic to - in cretics cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 424 πολυθέων = 419 πανδίκως; to say nothing of the licence generally attaching to names in tragedy.

On this patronymic the lexica seem unnecessarily reticent. The new L. and S. gives only 'the sons or descendants of Danaus, E. *Ph.* 466.' The word is extant in Euripides no less than twenty-seven times. Stephanus-Dindorf says 'de Graecis saepissime Eurip.' Throughout three whole plays, that is to say in twelve instances, it definitely does not mean 'Greeks.' The sons of Danaus are properly the Argives, and as such they are contrasted with other Greeks in *Suppl.* 130, 1151, 1190, 1220; *Phoen.* 466, 860, 1245, 1395; *Or.* 876, 933 (which I think genuine, cf. 1247, 1296), 1250, 1279. Elsewhere¹ in our poet, to whom (apart from the Senecan echo *Tro.* 607) it is confined, the name denotes Ἀργεῖοι in the Homeric sense, Greeks as opposed to Trojans.

II.

I must next prove what I have above taken for granted, that σοὶ in 1041

¹ *Hec.* 503; *Tro.* 447, 747; *I.T.* 359; *Hel.* 239 (with Φρυγῶν not far before, 229); *I.A.* 337, 352, 359, 729, 825, 1200, 1310, 1335, 1414, 1469.

apostrophises Andromache, not Hermione. Neither is present on the stage, nor again will be, and the Chorus are for the nonce alone; but while Andromache is just inside the house, Hermione is already (at the *tempo* of these final scenes) well on her way to join Menelaus *en route* for Sparta. Hermione as the prospective bride of Orestes has by now passed out of the picture, whereas the fortunes of Andromache are still in the balance. It is natural for these Phthian women to remind Hector's widow that the land of her captors has also suffered. And it is their function generally to condole with and to console her (117-146), but to reprove Hermione (154, 181-2, 492-3). With σοὶ = Andr., φίλοισι refers to Neoptolemus, whom the Chorus know (993-1008) to be a doomed man; and this gives a clear point, 'not even N. alone, but the Greeks generally'; with σοὶ = Herm., φίλοισι has no reference at all. Finally, in a stasimon of virtually identical general purport there is the very counterpart of this personal particularisation and this address (302).

III.

1037 πολλοὶ δ' ἀν' Ἑλλάνων ἀγρόους στοναχὰς
[ἀντ. β
μέλποντο δυστάνων τεκνών ἄλοχοι
ἐκ δ' ἔλειπον οἴκους
πρὸς ἄλλον εὐνάτορ'· οὐχὶ σοὶ μόνῃ
δυσφρονες κτλ.

The continuation is in section I.

For more reasons than I have space to indicate, only some of which are implicit in Hermann's note, it is tempting to understand the reference in 1037-41 as being to captive Trojan matrons; and thus it is taken also by Paley, Hyslop (1900-9), and Norwood (1906). Since, however, 1009-26 describe the devastation of Ilion and 1027-46 the desolation of Greece, an irruption of suffering Trojan captives at 1037-41 makes havoc both of ἀντ. β and of the stasimon as a whole.

When I first² proposed Δαναΐδαις, I took the opportunity to recommend³

² At a meeting of the Cambridge Philological Society on November 26, 1931.

³ *Camb. Univ. Reporter*, 1931-2, p. 435. The existing connexion of 1022-3 with 1027 is certainly both strong and good; but it is not invalidated by the transposition, only protracted.

for this reason the transposition of στρ. β with ἀντ. β. The same transposition had long ago been suggested with less warrant upon a different ground by Musgrave, who assumed our mourning women to be Greeks.

Yet lines 1037-41 remain oddly unsatisfactory,¹ although much less so, even when thus transported; and in subsequently seeking therefore to re-determine their text, I found myself driven into an alteration which, minute as it was, transformed the sense in such a way as to remove all difficulty and to establish the traditional order of this strophic pair.

The hiatus ἄλοχοι ἐκ is most suspicious; otherwise throughout this stasimon synapheia prevails. But the main difficulty is this, that between τεκέων and ἄλοχοι, no matter how construed, there subsists a false relation,² which to my taste their juxtaposition renders quite intolerable, and which has in fact caused grave critics to become variously entangled. Heath, for instance, excellent man, presents a straight front to the dilemma: 'Verte infeliciū filiorum conjuges, eorum scilicet, qui ad Trojam perierant, et quibus patres adhuc erant superstites, unde et filii appellantur.' [!] 'Nam versionem vulgarem, juxta quam uxores dicuntur propter infelices filios gemitus edidisse, vix probabilem puto, cum hae ipsae uxores mox dicuntur domos reliquisse, et ad alium maritum ivisse, quod non ob filii, sed ob mariti, mortem contigisse videtur.' [Precisely.] 'Puto tamen potius Eurip. scripsisse δυστάνων λεχέων . . .' And λεχέων is today once more the favoured reading, being accepted by Wecklein (ed. 1911; he construes differently) and by Méridier (ed. 1927). But δύστανα λέχη are not here in question, and the alteration has no probability. All three last-mentioned critics understand of Greek women; τεκέων is undoubtedly much easier if the women are Trojans, but even so there remains the hiatus, and the transposition, to me inevitable, is a serious change.

¹ E.g. the fate of Astyanax was noteworthy; Trojan children would normally be enslaved.

² ἄλοχοι never = mulieres, despite one scholium and Musgrave (whose two examples themselves refute him).

Murray's neglected³ τεκέων, ἄλοχοι δ' ἐξέλειπον obviates both hiatus and false relation, and has this further great advantage, that it relieves us at once of every awkwardness consequent upon the identification of the mourning mothers with the re-marrying widows. The reference is, indeed, unquestionably to the war-bereavements of the Greeks. Only so can Ἑλλάνων 1037 (to say nothing of its natural relation to 1027-36) enjoy its proper correspondence with Ἑλλὰς 1044; 1037-46 being in fact an admirable example of that characteristic Graecism 'polar expression'.⁴ And this interpretation is asserted three times over, with no alternative, by the scholia on 1038 and 1040.

Yet some disconcerting elements remain. πολλαὶ . . . ἄλοχοι δὲ is hardly competent Greek writing, whether in poetry or not; you could omit (say) αἱ μὲν before αἱ δὲ (e.g. *Il.* XXII. 157, *Soph. Tr.* 117, etc.), or you could omit μὲν, but with the sense ματέρες μὲν . . . ἄλοχοι δὲ I do not see that you could evade the ματέρες. ἄλοχοι δὲ points to some antithetic term; and this I find to hand at once in τοκέων, the reading not only of two good manuscripts but of the scholiast's lemma. ' . . . τοκέων, ἄλοχοι δὲ . . .', chiasmus with case-variation, is an excellent Greek alternative for τοκέες μὲν . . . ἄλοχοι δὲ. πολλαὶ must inevitably have appeared in this gender after the corruption had occurred which Murray corrects; therefore it does not follow that it was previously so.

I read πολλοὶ, construing πολλοὶ . . . τοκέων across the whole sentence as in πολλοὺς . . . Τρώων *Il.* XVIII. 27, cf. *Od.* XVII. 596; for intervening substantive (etc.) cf. *Soph. O.T.* 981, *Eur. Ion.* 381. 'Many too are the grief-stricken⁵ parents that fill the public gathering-places of the Greeks with the cry of mourning, while the widows pass to other husbands.' These are they whom a war desolates, τοκέες τ' ἄλοχοί τε *Aesch. Pers.* 63; cf. *Il.* XXIV. 741-2, XVII. 28, 36-7. In *Tro.* 380-1 the sentence is of course unintelligible, but if

³ For Schroeder too ignores it, his *Eur. Cantica*, p. 37, sanctioning the hiatus.

⁴ Of which my stock illustration is from this play—line 248.

⁵ δύστ. τοκ. as δειλοὺς τοκ. in *Il.* XXIII. 223.

my following reconstruction of it be substantially sound (as also, obviously, if it be not) that is a piece of Euripidean rhetoric which will be in point here: *χῆραί τ' ἔθνησκον, οἱ δ' ἄπαιδες ἐν δόμοις | χηρῶν ἐλεινοὶ μᾶλλον ἐπεβίουν τοκεῖς | ἄλλως τέκν' ἐκθρέφαντες, οὐδὲ πρὸς τάφοις κτλ.*

The loss of a nation's manhood does not bring grief only to its womankind. As I have already said, this whole stasimon has a faithful duplicate in 274-308, and sure enough that bears out πολλοί, just as it confirms τοκέων, in

the last word of the passage which patently corresponds with ours; 307-8 *λέχη τ' ἔρημ' ἂν οὐποτ' ἐξελείπετο, | καὶ τεκέων ὄρφανοὶ γέροντες.* And that our passage likewise is concerned with Greeks, not simply nor even primarily with Greek women, is shown by its own φίλοισι and Ἑλλάς as well as by Δαναΐδαις.

I submit that *ἀντ. β* is at last readable; and that with hardly a change.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

University of Liverpool.

VIRGIL, GEORGICS II. 39-45.

Tuque ades inceptumque una decurre laborem, o decus, o famae merito pars maxuma nostrae, Maecenas, pelagoque volans da vela patenti; non ego cuncta meis amplecti versibus opto, non, mihi si linguae centum sint oraque centum, ferrea vox; ades et primi lege litoris oram, in manibus terrae.

MOST editors content themselves with noting the discrepancy (not to say, the contradiction) here between l. 41 and ll. 44, 5. Some attempt to explain it away; of these, Martyn (1741) and Page (1898) are the most plausible, but all are quite unconvincing. Heyne, surprisingly, ignores it. The long note in Servius merely darkens counsel.

Less attention, I think, than it merits has been paid to Peerlkamp's proposal to reverse the order of ll. 41 and 42 and alter *da* to *dare*. If once DAREVELA got into the text as DAVELA, which might easily happen, the transposition

of the lines would be the inevitable consequence. There are cases in the *Aeneid* where transposition is needed and can be satisfactorily made; five such seem all but certain: VIII. 654 to be put between 641 and 642; IX. 241 between 243 and 244; X. 665 between 662 and 663; X. 717, 8 between 713 and 714; and XI. 266-8 between 263 and 264. In all these, the misplacement is probably due to the state in which the original editors found the Virgilian autograph, and consequent uncertainty as to the order meant by Virgil himself. This does not apply to the text of the *Georgics*. But in the vexed passage *Georg.* IV. 287-294 the three primary MSS. have each a different order for ll. 291-3 (a, b, c in M, b, a, c in P, a, c, b in R).

J. W. MACKAIL.

VERGIL AND OCTAVIAN.

THE interesting and important article contributed by my friend Mr. W. F. J. Knight to the *C.R.* for May (p. 55) on the *animam superbam* of Brutus, the foe of the Tarquins (*Aen.* VI. 817), will, I hope, command the general assent of scholars in its chief contention. It is, I am afraid, a confession of culpable ignorance, but I had never taken the passage myself, nor realised that it had¹ ever been taken, in any other way

than Mr. Knight does; and I had always seen in it a typical example of Vergil's method of suggesting more than he says by the arrangement of his sentence. Every reader knew that the Tarquins were *superbi* (which, with Mr. Knight, I translate² 'overbearing,' and

Had Vergil meant what one illustrious commentator supposes, he could have written the line *fascisque uliori Bruto cognosse receptos*—the verb *cognoscere* is a favourite word (e.g. *Ecl.* IV. 60, *Aen.* V. 474).

² Perhaps the word 'towering' would serve even better; Vergil uses the word of cities set upon hills.

¹ That any Latin scholar can suppose that *Bruti*, placed where it is, depends on anything but *animam* fills me, I confess, with regret.

often 'cruel'); and this line intimates that their destroyer matched them in this quality of soul. There is a point in the word *anima*; for it applies especially to what one may call the fundamental part of a man's personality, what modern psychologists call the UNC(onscious), which should, if it be normal, prevent a man from putting his own sons to death. But Brutus's political zeal overrode all that—it knew no limits, and trampled on the ordinary decent instincts of human life—rightly or wrongly, Vergil does not say; but Brutus's sentence upon his sons was the act of *anima superba*, just as much as the crimes of the Tarquins.

With equal conviction I welcome Mr. Knight's further point, that the phrase suggested the same quality in the descendant, or supposed descendant, of the ancient Bruti in Vergil's day—another *anima superba*, and in the same sense as the Tarquins', when it came to exacting his 48 per cent. from the town-councillors of Salamis by starving several of them (*non nulli*) in their own town-hall.¹ And even if one knew nothing of his acts, the spirit of the man breathes rank in his letters to Cicero. And Julius Caesar, whether he was the father of his assassin or not, was certainly another *anima superba*, though he used commonly a more gentlemanly address. But the steel-like quality² which lay behind his courtesies and generousities and ideals of political conciliation appears continually in his acts, as in his order for the solemn butchery in sacrifice to Mars of two of his own discontented soldiers, which Mr. Knight has mentioned.

So far, therefore, I have only to express again the gratitude which in common with other students of Vergil I have long felt for Mr. Knight's series of thoughtful and original papers. But I must demur when he proceeds to explain that this particular detail of

human sacrifice is included (*Aen.* X. 517) among the acts of Aeneas in order 'to furnish an heroic and legendary precedent for such an atrocity.' . . . 'Since Octavianus had sacrificed human beings, Aeneas must certainly on some appropriate occasion do so too.'

No one who has studied the *Aeneid* in its historical aspect will, I think, deny that most of the conspicuous events of Vergil's lifetime have left some impress on the poem, and Octavian's cold-blooded slaughter of three hundred senators and knights at Perusia in 41 must have been known to Vergil. So were the feats of Caesar, Pompey and Crassus, and in a famous passage of the Second Book of the *Georgics* (503-512) Vergil holds them up to execration. The best thing that Vergil could say of the iron-hearted Dictator was the suggestion that he had been—or might have been, for the words can mean either (*tuque prior, tu parce, Aen.* VI. 835)—the first to make efforts to obtain peace, efforts which of course he did make at certain epochs.

Again, Mr. Knight is demonstrably right when he hints at the special ('appropriate') circumstances in which Aeneas is represented, even on one occasion and even in a peculiarly limited way, as having done the same thing. And Professor W. P. Clark, whom he quotes, is not less right in pointing out, as indeed had been done before,³ that measures of exceptional sternness, like the killing of Mezentius and Turnus, and like the heaviest penalties in Vergil's Underworld, are always in Vergil's story incurred by some *superbia*, that is some act of trampling on natural human instincts, especially the instinct of affection.

But if Mr. Knight had pushed his analysis of the 'appropriate' conditions for this behaviour of Aeneas a little further, I think he would have escaped what seems to me a strange misconception of Vergil's attitude to historical events.

When Mr. Knight reads *Othello*, and is led to admire that great warrior, as

¹ See Cic. *Att.* V. 21; VI. 1 and 2.
² On this darker side of the Dictator's strange personality, on which Mommsen and the English scholars who have followed him are always silent, see ch. 1 of *Makers of Europe* (Harvard University Press, 1931).

³ *Vergil's Messianic Eclogue* (1907), p. 47; and Warde Fowler's *Death of Turnus* (1919), p. 156—to go no further back.

Shakespeare meant him to, does he proceed to infer that Shakespeare approved of the murder of Desdemona? Would it not strike him as almost ludicrous to suggest that, by depicting that deed, Shakespeare 'furnished an heroic precedent' for any one of the cruel murders of the Tudors? When the First Book of the *Aeneid* represents Aeneas in terror in the storm, and prepared to abandon his whole enterprise, 'cursing God,' as the Book of Job has it, for his having been sent on such a mission, does Mr. Knight look then for a similar incident in Octavian's career and show that Vergil has provided a precedent for it? When Dido is led into the happiness which proves her ruin by the treachery of the two politicians Juno and Venus, will Mr. Knight contend that Vergil approved all that Dido did, and all the wild curses that she uttered at the end? Does Vergil approve the means which Venus, the patron deity of the Julian House, had taken to protect her son and Vergil's hero? It is quite true that Vergil's story explains Dido's curse, and that he fills us with pity for the wrong which she suffered, like so many women who were the victims of Octavian's political designs. Vergil saw these things happening all around him, and saw their fruit in such tragedies as the Punic Wars, which he represents as the direct outcome of Dido's curse, and in the Civil Wars, which he represents as springing from the deeds of his own *impia saecula* (*G.* I. 468, 489-502). If men will do such things, and so long as men do them, easy as it may be for them to yield to the temptation, yet, so Vergil's story declares, the outcome will always be tragic. But that is not the same thing as saying that Vergil approved of such tragedies, or sought to 'furnish a precedent' for them.

In this light consider the incident which Mr. Knight adduces—the reservation by Aeneas of eight prisoners to be sent with the body of Pallas to be sacrificed at his funeral pyre. A whole Book of the *Iliad* is taken up with the Games at the funeral of Patroclus, and one of the items in the Homeric programme, an item beloved

by the Etruscan¹ painters, was the sacrifice of twelve Trojan prisoners at the pyre. In Book II. of the *Aeneid*, Vergil recognises this feature of the 'Heroic' age in the story of Sinon, who escaped from the fate which Calchas had inflicted on Iphigenia, and had destined, or was said to have destined, for him. These things happened. They happened at Rome under the terror of the Hannibalic invasion (*minime Romanum sacrum*, says² Livy); and when Julius Caesar in Rome, with Cleopatra³ at his elbow, lost his temper with his own discontented veterans. But under what conditions does this appear in the story of Aeneas?

We may observe, in passing, two hints of the reluctance with which Vergil reproduces this Homeric detail. He reduces the number of victims from twelve to eight, and he carefully avoids any statement as to whether they were actually slain. But that Aeneas intended them to be slain, if Evander wished it, there is no doubt at all (*inferias quos immolet umbris* x. 519; *quos mitteret umbris inferias* xi. 81).

The question is, how did Aeneas come to entertain this purpose? Does the context suggest that Vergil regarded it as an example to be followed, so that Octavian could find in it with satisfaction a precedent for his own butcheries? The answer seems to me clear, though so many generations of commentators have overlooked it that I cannot reproach Mr. Knight for overlooking it also.

In a lecture on *Vergil's Creative Art* two years ago⁴ I did my best to analyse the structure of the Tenth Book, and I pointed out what, when once it is noticed, is incontrovertible, that Vergil has divided the fighting of Aeneas into two parts, that which preceded (308-354) and that which followed (513-604) the death of the young prince

¹ See e.g. a painting from the 'François tomb' in Poulsen, *Etruscan Tomb Painting*, p. 12, reproduced in John Rylands Libr. Bull. xvi. (1932), p. 390.

² xxii. 57. 6.

³ Dio Cass. xliii. 27.

⁴ British Academy Proceedings, 1931 (Hertz Annual Lecture on Aspects of Art, delivered in October, 1930).

Pallas, for whom Aeneas felt responsible. In the first passage Aeneas is on the defensive; he repels attacks, but he does not make them, and the result is a standstill, *haeret pede pes densusque viro vir* (361). But when Aeneas receives the tragical news, he is transformed by his fury—that is the right word. Vergil himself calls him *furens* (604; *furit* 545), and of course the word means more in Latin than in English. He is 'mad'; he can see nothing but Pallas and Evander; Pallas slain; his aged father broken by bereavement; Aeneas shamed by having failed to keep his promise to protect him—though it is only from Aeneas himself that we learn that he had made such a promise (XI. 151). The first act of this 'madness' is the seizure of the eight young men. In what follows Aeneas is compared to the giant Aegaeon who rebelled against Jove, to a raging torrent or a black whirlwind. Scene follows scene of slaughter, in which Aeneas refuses every petition for mercy and not merely gives no quarter but dispatches his victims with bitter taunts.

We read that Octavian did the same² after Philippi, though then it was in cold blood. But is Mr. Knight, or anyone else, prepared to maintain that in this picture of Berserker rage, of the madness of slaughter 'when the blade is hot,' Vergil is representing something that he commends?

Here, as everywhere, Vergil's imagination is true to life; he pictures the horror of such things, because he knew it was part of life, and he pictures the motives that breed such a temper with no less unerring touch. But to say that he approved them, or that those who had so acted found their conduct

justified, is surely to be blind to the deepest passion that moulded Vergil's art—the passion of humanity.

I shall not believe that this description can apply to Mr. Knight, unless he bids me do so in so many words; but I venture to think he has been too much under the influence of what I must persist in calling the blinking habits of some commentators, who are afraid to believe in the power which genius has, of penetrating to the truth and stamping it upon other men's minds.

The comment to which Mr. Knight's article has led me will serve as an answer to the polite reproofs of Mr. K. R. Potter in his notice of my four lectures on *Makers of Europe*.³ He has indeed rightly understood my general position, and he correctly quotes some unimportant words, describing a few commonplaces of political philosophy. But I must respectfully submit that every other opinion he attributes to me has been, no doubt unconsciously, distorted by his dislike of my point of view. For example, I have nowhere called Cicero 'a great political thinker.' What I tried to show was that his courageous defence of enlightened principles, which he had himself sifted and confirmed in practice, a defence which cost him his life, had exercised profound influence⁴ on history. Nor did I apply the epithet which Mr. Potter finds unwelcome to people at large who may not share my opinions; I reserved it for those who defend a peculiarly vulgar view of the relation of Vergil and Horace to Octavian, which Mr. Potter himself is wise enough to disown.

R. S. CONWAY.

St. Albans.

¹ And this is the only time that such an epithet is applied to him in the whole twelve Books, though there is *furor* as well as *ira* when he sees that Troy is in flames (II. 316), and later, when he catches sight of Helen in hiding (588). But Venus (in other words, his own gentler instincts) calms his mad desire for vengeance.

² Sueton. *Aug.* 13.

³ *C.R.*, 1932, p. 70.

⁴ Since this article was written, Professor Tenney Frank in his Master-Mind Lecture to the British Academy on June 8, 1932, has admirably maintained the same view. The evidence he brings of the influence of Cicero upon the American constitution (Proc. of the Br. Ac. of that date, p. 4.) is especially interesting.

TYRAION AGAIN.

I CARELESSLY omitted in *C.R.* XLVI, p. 154, the evidence of Pliny *N.H.* V 95. Pliny certainly wrote *Tyrienses*: all *vv.ll.* point to that. Pliny's value is the value of his authority. In his list of authors quoted in Book V he does not mention Xenophon, only Xenophon Ephesius; yet one may conjecture that he remembered the spelling in the *Anabasis*, and conclude that the incorrect form had already found its way into Xenophon's text.

The suggestion made by Hermolaus Barbarus founded on Steph. Byz. Ὑρία, that Hyrienes is meant here, is topographically impossible: the place that Pliny meant is in the *conventus* of Philomelium (i.e. the Lycaonian *conventus*); Hyria is described by Steph. as κατὰ Ἰσαυρίας Σελεύκειαν. The entire Isaurian *conventus* (meeting at Iconium) lies between. Ὑρία of Isauria is perhaps Οὔρα (neut. plur.), Οὔρα (sing., Ὀλβη Strab.; compare Δύστρον, Δύστροις, N.T.).

W. M. RAMSAY.

ΜΕΤΡΑ ΘΑΛΑΣΣΗΣ AND KYMATA METPEIN.

(See *C.R.* XLV. 10-12, 117-8, 172-3.)

(i) HDT. I. 47, Apollo speaking through the Pythia, οἶδα δ' ἐγὼ ψάμμον τ' ἀριθμὸν καὶ μέτρα θαλάσσης. In *C.R.* XLV. 117-8 I explained μέτρα as 'dimensions' or liquid content, citing *inter alia* Plato *Theaet.* 173D αὐτῆς θαλάττης λεγόμενοι χῶες. It seems worth while now to quote in full a passage adduced by Stallbaum *ad loc.*, confirming as it surely does my (natural) interpretation by relating this last-mentioned expression to that other proverb and to the god: Themistius, p. 97=116 Dindorf, διὰ τοῦτο ἀρα δὲ Πύθιος τῆς μὲν ψάμμον τὸν ἀριθμὸν οὐκ ἐδίσταζεν ὁπόση εἴη οὐδὲ τῆς θαλάττης τοὺς χῶας.¹ To

¹ Mr. Gow, who in raising the question suggested a far more recondite sense for μ. θ.,

that I can now add a corroboration from three centuries earlier, and itself still neater; Lucan V. 182, of Apollo's priestess at Delphi when possessed by his spirit, uati . . . non modus Oceani, numerus non derat harenae.

(ii) Theocr. XVI. 60, ἀλλ' ἴσος γὰρ ὁ μόχθος ἐπ' ἥνι κύματα μετρεῖν. I maintained that the point here was, by contrast, not the nicety of the knowledge but the infinity of the sum; and this I think is supported by the context in (another reference *ap.* Stallbaum *ad Plat. l.c.*) Lucian *Amor.* 2, θάπτον ἄν μοι, ὦ Λυκίνε, θαλάττης κύματα καὶ πικρὰς ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ νιφάδας ἀριθμῆσαι ἢ τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἔρωτας, an illustration which I would add to Virgil *G. II.* 103 (*not* 105)—108.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

University of Liverpool.

ONCE MORE AESCHYLUS, *SEPTEM*,

13-12.

(See *C.R.*, XLVI, p. 155.)

PROFESSOR A. Y. CAMPBELL disagrees with my interpretation and reading of the above lines. This is matter of opinion, and he is perfectly within his rights in not being convinced. But when he says that my suggestion is 'in fact impossible, since it leaves ὑμᾶς δὲ χρῆ νῦν without an infinitive,' he is mistaken on a point of fact. In my interpretation of the passage, as in every other that ever I heard of, χρῆ governs ἀρήγειν; I suppose that συμπεπείς (εἶσι) also governs it, ἀπὸ κοινοῦ. If there were no harder constructions than this in Aeschylus, he would be an easy author to interpret.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

would seem not to know this passage, since in his second note he refers to another passage of Themistius, but not to this.

REVIEWS

THE ODYSSEY IN QUATRAINS.

The Odyssey translated into Verse. By J. W. MACKAIL. Pp. ix+514. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932. Cloth, 18s. net.

DR. MACKAIL has placed both the scholar and the general reader under a deep obligation by reissuing in a revised form and in a single volume his well-known translation of the *Odyssey*, which first appeared in three volumes between 1903 and 1910 and has long been out of print.

The first problem which confronts the

translator of Homer is the choice of a suitable metre. The hexameter has somehow never really become naturalised in English literature as it has in German; the heroic couplet is too confined a channel for the rapid flow of Homeric thought; good blank verse is notoriously difficult to write and tends to become monotonous in a poem of the length of the *Odyssey*—at any rate it has never been used with complete success for translating Homer. Dr. Mackail has struck out a new line in using the

same metre as Edward Fitzgerald used in his version of Omar Khayyám, though, as he tells us in his introduction, he had chosen it more than fifty years ago, before he had read Fitzgerald's then little-known masterpiece.

The success of this metre for Homeric translation is undoubted. Perhaps its greatest excellence is that it possesses something of the rapidity of Homer—it carries the reader on in much the same way as does Homer's verse; also, like the Homeric hexameter, it is capable of infinite variety.

But choice of metre is not everything; the translator of Homer must also be a scholar and himself a poet, and it would be difficult to find anyone so well equipped in both these respects as Dr. Mackail. In short, Dr. Mackail's version produces upon the reader who knows his Homer much of the same effect as the original—it has movement, variety, simplicity and dignity—and this is the real test of a successful translation.

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

University of Sheffield.

GREEK ELEGY AND IAMBUS.

Elegy and Iambus. Newly edited and translated by J. M. EDMONDS. Two vols. Pp. xvi+523 and vi+390. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1931. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) each.

In these two volumes Mr. Edmonds completes his work on the fragments of early Greek poetry and gives us the remains of elegiac and iambic verse from Callinus to Crates with an appendix of the *Anacreontea*. There is much here that will be of great use to students of all kinds; and if these volumes do not meet every need, that is due more to the extreme difficulty of the subject than to Mr. Edmonds's treatment of it.

Of chief use for scholars is undoubtedly the admirable collection of testimonia which is placed before the fragments of each author. Such a collection exists nowhere else and has been made with admirable sense and remarkable industry. It is, of course, indispensable for the serious study of these authors, and Mr. Edmonds has put us all in his debt by providing it. Nothing of importance is omitted, and henceforward the traditions about these poets will be accessible to everyone. This does not mean that Bergk's admirable discussions are superseded, but it does mean that in future it will be easier to check Bergk by direct reference to the original authorities.

The text is as complete as can be desired and on the whole considerably less adventurous than Mr. Edmonds's

other work might have led us to expect. The traditional fragments appear in their familiar form, and though Mr. Edmonds admits his own corrections, they are not of a kind to excite hostility. When he deals with the papyrus fragments, he follows his old rule of providing a text that can be read and claims no final authority for it. In Tyrtaeus fr. 1, where the papyrus does not leave much room for doubt about the meaning, this method is quite successful, but Mr. Edmonds has assailed a more difficult task in his reconstruction of the fragments of Archilochus on the Parian monument. Despite his new squeezes and the ingenuity of his supplements, Mr. Edmonds's restoration does not carry conviction. His text is too difficult and too colloquial to be really like that of Archilochus, and here Mr. Edmonds has been carried too far by the excitement of restoration. Elsewhere, however, there is small ground for complaint. The Strasbourg fragments of Archilochus appear in an unexpectedly familiar guise, and the corrections in Solon are more successful than many previous shots.

The translation is adequate. In places we may disagree, but in such fragments certainty is impossible. Does ἀρπαλέως in Mimnermus fr. 8 l. 7 mean 'pleasant'? or οὐχ εὖροις in Theognis 83 'thou shalt not find'? Nor does αἰζύς in Archilochus fr. 52 seem likely to mean 'misery,' or ῥυσμός in fr. 66 'temper.' But these are small disputable points in a translation where the

fragr
vides
TH
a co
Eng
has
talen
His
arch
late
pow
age.
wort
Eng
metr

The
L
B
V
xx
vi
C
WH
the
was
publ
offer
circ
whic
com
usef
any
are
cate
rupt
In
refer
Eng
tion
pub
men
fille
Dor
Pim
Pyth
brou
is so
tant
Auf
T
but
is
Pim

fragmentary nature of the material provides endless difficulties.

The appendix of *Anacreontea* contains a complete translation into rhymed English verse. Here Mr. Edmonds has found something more suited to his talents than Sappho or Theocritus. His taste for the precious and the archaic is much more at home with these late productions than it was with the powerful and direct poetry of an early age. And these translations are quite worth a place in the long series of English anacreontics. The varied metres, copied from the Caroline poets,

are well suited to such amiable trifles.

Finally there is a good historical survey, full of information and even of ideas unfamiliar in our textbooks. Mr. Edmonds deals ably with Theognis and refuses to acquiesce in any facile unity of authorship. He distinguishes between the different periods of elegiac verse and has some good comments on its historical development. An unduly neglected branch of scholarship treated in this manner may well have good results.

C. M. BOWRA.

Wadham College, Oxford.

THE WORKS OF PINDAR TRANSLATED.

The Works of Pindar translated, with Literary and Critical Commentaries.

By LEWIS RICHARD FARNELL.
Vol. II.: Critical commentary. Pp. xxx+489. Vol. III.: The text. Pp. viii+184. London: Macmillan, 1932. Cloth, 30s.

WHILE the first volume of this work, the translation (see *C.R.* 1931, p. 136), was intended 'mainly for the literary public,' the second, the commentary, is offered 'to the judgment of the narrower circle of Greek scholars.' The third, which contains the text, is a necessary companion to the others, but its general usefulness is diminished by the lack of any *apparatus criticus*, though asterisks are used, rather spasmodically, to indicate emendations, and 'hopelessly corrupt passages' are marked with a dagger.

In the commentary there are very few references to periodical literature, even English, and it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that nothing of any kind published in the last eight years is mentioned at all. The background is filled by the English editors from Donaldson to Sandys, by Wilamowitz's *Pindaros*, and by Schroeder's text and *Pythians* commentary, with Gaspar brought in for chronology. Fraccaroli is scarcely mentioned, and such important recent work as Schadewaldt's *Aufbau* (1928) is wholly ignored.

These deficiencies are regrettable, but in the long run what matters most is Farnell's positive contribution to Pindaric study. Here there is much

to praise. The excursus on Pindar's religion is very interesting, and the general discussions of many odes (for example, *Ol.* iv, *Pyth.* ii, *Nem.* vi, and *Isth.* ii) are valuable. Farnell faces every *crux* and never leaves his own view doubtful, and he suggests some happy interpretations. At the same time the book has serious defects, some of which seem to be due to imperfect sympathy with Pindar's artistic methods. Farnell's praise is mostly for details: he has little appreciation of Pindar's broad architecture, and often arraigns him on irrelevantly Augustan standards. Pindar 'has slightly lost his head and committed anakolouthon' (*Nem.* i. 37): he shows (in *Nem.* iii. 52 ff.) 'more than his usual carelessness in respect to the order of events'—as if his object were to tell stories in strict chronological sequence.

In the matter of the text the absence of an *apparatus* is not fully compensated in Volume II. The editor assumes that his readers will have access to the large Schroeder, and deals with the MSS. perfunctorily and sometimes carelessly. For example, he misstates the facts about *Ol.* i. 50 by confusing Pindar's MS. A with Athenaeus: in *Ol.* ii. 76 (84) he is unaware that *Ox. Pap.* 2092, published in 1927, has turned Pauw's emendation <μ<ε>γας into an attested reading: and on *Pyth.* ix. 38 he wrongly gives χλιερὸν as a MS. reading, and muddles the facts about the 'Ambrosian' and 'Vatican' witnesses. The

strangest instance is his note on *Nem.* vii. 18, where he writes: 'The reading βλάβεν may be regarded as certain. The palaeographic facts are sometimes carelessly stated in the older editions. λάβεν is the only reading of the MS. (D): Triclinius proposed βάλον, possibly from a Byzantine MS. Combining them, we discern βλάβεν. . . .' In fact βλάβεν is the reading of the great Vatican MS., B: Farnell has misunderstood Schroeder's critical note (which leaves B's reading, as usual, to be inferred) and has not consulted Mommsen before rebuking his predecessors. He takes very little interest in the authorship of emendations (Pauw's <μέ>γας, for instance, he calls 'the emendation accepted by Schroeder'), and sometimes gives nineteenth-century critics undeserved credit. The excellent Erasmus Schmid, who has left his unassuming mark on every page of the text, fares especially ill, for he gets only two or three mentions, all unfavourable. Farnell is especially interested in errors traceable to the misreading of Pindar's original Boeotian script, and he works this method rather hard, though in criticising others he sometimes (e.g. on *Ol.* ix. 112) forgets his own principles. He can scarcely be right in believing (despite Schroeder's warning) that the Thoman and Moschopulean MSS. Ξ and q have preserved an original tradition in their ἐρχομενοῦ in *Ol.* xiv. 4.

With regard to metre he is non-committal, though he pays some lip-service to Schroeder and Wilamowitz. He is sceptical of Schroeder's favourite choriambic equations, though he is not altogether consistent on this point (he ignores Bowra's article on the subject in *C.Q.* 1930, p. 174). He holds strongly that Pindar freely equated trochees, dactyls, and spondees, and, partly in order to avoid Heyne's easy insertion of <νυ> after στεφάνοισι(ν) in *Pyth.* i. 37, he prints an extraordinarily clumsy parenthesis from Λύκιε to τιθέμεν, attaching εὐανδρόν τε χώραν to ὀνυμαστὰν. In this case, however, it should be added that he himself regards the new sentence as 'incomparably better' than the ordinary text. Again in *Nem.* v. 41 he prints Αἰγίνα θεᾶς, rejecting Schwartz's palmary correction Αἰγίναθε

δῆς, the merits of which are not confined to the removal of a spondee corresponding to five parallel dactyls. His strangest metrical aberration is his repeated assertion (pp. xxiii, 394, 399) that in the *Paean*s the epodes within the same poem do not correspond in metre: 'the only agreement noted is between epode β and γ of *Paean* ii' (p. 394). In fact, wherever the principle can be tested (in *Paean* ii α, as well as β and γ, and in *Paean* vi α and β) the correspondence is normal.

Farnell is, indeed, much too prone to baseless generalisations, often put forward in support of sound particular contentions. Twice (pp. 192, 289) he lays down the principle that 'one cannot "emend" figures: one can only reject them': yet on p. 102 he applauds Gaspar's ΖΓ for ΖΦ in the date of *Ol.* xiv. On p. 236 he says that 'Pindar nowhere uses the word μναστήρ in the Homeric sense of "wooer"': he so uses it in *Ol.* i. 80 and *Pyth.* ix. 106. There is a similar false statement about the patronymic Κρόνιος in the note on *Ol.* iii. 23. In grammar, too, there are strange assertions. In the course of a valuable note on *Isth.* ii. 35 (μακρὰ δισκήσαις ἀκοντίσσαιμι τοσοῦθ') he says that 'when the principal verb has a present or future reference' the use of the past participle 'always means that the action expressed by the former is over before that of the latter begins.' This can be refuted by reference to *Pyth.* i. 45, ῥίψαις, *Ol.* iii. 3, ὀρθώσαις, or *Ol.* vii. 5, τιμάσαις. On *Ol.* viii. 54 he says, referring to a *protasis* (εἰ δ' . . . ἀνέδραμον . . . μὴ βαλέτω), 'the past tense in a conditional sentence always expresses something unrealised, something that had not been.' Yet he censures Wilamowitz for supposing in the single instance of *Pyth.* xi. 41 ff. that εἰ . . . συνέθεν 'expresses an unfulfilled condition' and not (as Farnell holds) 'something that had happened.'

There are other passages which throw doubt on Farnell's feeling for Greek syntax. In *Pyth.* ii. 20 'having seen safety' is surely an impossible rendering of δρακεῖσ' ἀσφαλές, and in *Pyth.* iv. 57 he prints ἡ ῥα Μηδεία Φεῶν στίχας, giving ἡμὶ a noun object (he pronounces ἡρα 'unintelligible', though in *Isth.* vi.

55 he prints *ὡς ἦρα Φειπὼν αὐτίκα ἔζεν*, which is almost exactly parallel).

A few further comments must be briefly made. In *Ol.* i. 26 ff. he adopts the usual view that Poseidon fell in love with a new-born baby. Fraccaroli's theory, that Pindar starts on the traditional story, and then suddenly rejects it, seems greatly preferable. Farnell, however, refuses this form of narrative even to the story of Herakles's fight with three gods in *Ol.* ix. 28 ff., and there translates *ἐπεὶ . . . πῶς ἂν* 'For how could it be true that . . .?' This version is based on an imaginary difficulty, and is not easy to reconcile with the detailed description of the battle. In *Ol.* ii. 27 (30) he ignores Wilamowitz's attractive punctuation after *πατήρ*. In *Ol.* iii he does not seriously discuss the plausible view that Herakles visited the Hyperboreans only once. In *Ol.* xiii. 41 he makes an imaginary difficulty of the phrase *Πτοδοῶρ σὺν πατρὶ* through failure to see that lines 35-40 refer solely (as Erasmus Schmid perceived) to Thessalus, son of Ptoeodorus and father of Xenophon. He gives in *Pyth.* iii. 16 an impossible sense ('she could not expect that to her would come the bridal feast') to *οὐκ ἔμειν' ἔλθειν τράπεζαν νυμφίαν*, and rejects the obvious view, that Apollo intended to find Coronis a suitable bridegroom after her child's birth. His comment on line 67 of the same ode contains a strange suggestion. The ode, it will be remembered, opens with the wish that Chiron were still alive, Chiron the nurturer of Asklepios; and in line 63, after the long narrative of Asklepios's birth, life, and death, Pindar returns to his opening thought. 'But if Chiron still dwelt in his cave, and my sweet songs could bewitch him,' *ἱατῆρά τοί κέν νιν πίθον —καί νυν ἐσλοῖσι παρασχεῖν ἀνδράσιν θερμὰν νόσων | ἢ τινα Λατοῖδα κεκλημένον ἢ πατέρος. | καὶ κεν ἐν νανσὶν μόλον Ἴονίαν τάμνων θάλασσαν | Ἀρέθουσιν ἐπὶ κράνῃ παρ' Αἰτναῖον ξένον*. Farnell writes: 'In spite of the mythic reference to Cheiron, he means something sensible or at least conceivable; and not even Pindar could conceive himself sailing away to heal Hieron with Asklepios or Apollo as his fellow-passenger. The word *τινα* alone shows that it is

not the real Asklepios or the real Apollo that he has in mind; the indefinite *τις* added to a personal name means "someone like . . .", "a second . . .", e.g. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 181 *Ὀδυσσεῖα τινα* "a second Odysseus", Aesch. *Ag.* 1233 *Σκύλλαν τινα* "a second Skulla" (Clutaimnestra). . . . Therefore Pindar's phrase can mean what we want it to mean, "some great living physician . . ." . . . Only thus the phrase becomes intelligible. It would be still more intelligible if there were two eminent contemporary physicians whom Pindar wishes to recommend, one called Apollonios, another Zenon or Diogenes, so well known that Hieron could interpret the slightly enigmatic phrases describing their names.' The point about *τινα* is weak: a far better parallel is *ἡ τις Ἀπόλλων* in *Ag.* 55: and as for the general argument—as well might an English poet write: 'If Merlin still dwelt in Broceliande, I might persuade him to lend me Sir Humphry Rolleston or Sir Farquhar Buzzard.'

The statement in the note on *Pyth.* viii. 1 that 'Pindar is the first to personify *Ἥσυχία* in Greek literature' should take account of Epicharmus fr. 101 K. Postgate (*Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc.*, 1906) should be given credit for the interpretation of *καταβολάν* in *Nem.* ii. 4, claimed as new. The argument strongly urged on p. 426, that fr. 104 C cannot be a *Partheneion* because the poet speaks in it in the first person, is inconsistent with Farnell's own note on the close of the undoubted *Partheneion* 104 D, where he takes Pindar to task for untimely 'self-advertisement.'

Among the more interesting comments are the perhaps too ingenious view that *ταμεινομέναν* in *Ol.* viii. 30 means 'held in trust for' and the defence of *δαῖτα κλυτὰν* in line 52 of the same ode. In *Pyth.* iv. 186-187 he proposes an attractive new interpretation of *ἐπὶ καὶ θανάτῳ*, and twelve lines later he makes the good suggestion that *ἀμπνοῶν ἔστασαν* means 'held their breath.' Less plausible is his proposal in the same context to treat all the accusatives in 194 ff. except *Ζῆνα* as *things prayed for*, not *powers prayed to*. His statement that 'all commentators' have taken the other view is in any case

wrong, since Erasmus Schmid in 1616 took the words exactly as he does. The position of *ἐκάλει* in connection with the *καί*'s and *τε*'s seems a fatal objection, and the assertion that 'no one ever personified "waves," still less "the tides of waves and winds,"' is hardly reconcilable with *Prom. Vinc.* 89.

The discussion of the date of *Nem.* vi has the rare merit of making proper use of the year (544 B.C.) of Praxidamas's Olympic victory, which is fatal, as Farnell points out, to Gaspar's late dating. It is arguable, however, that this evidence points more naturally to a date considerably earlier than 'shortly before 460 B.C.' In the note on *Nem.* vii. 70 ff. there is a valuable discussion of the *pentathlon* and of its bearing on this passage, and in *Nem.* ix. 18 ff. there are two striking suggestions, the first that *ὁδόν* has the technical sense 'birds' path,' and the second, which is not claimed as wholly new, that the discouraging omen was the *absence* of a thunder-clap. Against the first suggestion may perhaps be urged the parallel

language of *Eum.* 770, and against the second the loss of picturesqueness and the suggestion of illumination in the following words *φαινομένην δ' ἄρ' ἐς ἄταν*, but both deserve to be carefully weighed. In *Isth.* ii. 35 there is much to be said for Farnell's insistence that *δισκήσας* and *ἀκοντίσσαιμι* should be given full force and referred to events of the *pentathlon*, and in *Isth.* vi. 14 his suggestion that *ὄργαις* should be separated from *ἀντιάσας* removes a difficulty and gives a satisfactory sentence.

In *Isth.* viii. 47 he makes the attractive suggestion that *καὶ νεαρὰν ἔδειξαν σοφῶν | στόματ' ἀπείροισιν ἀρετὰν* 'Ἀχιλλεύς' refers not to poets celebrating the hero's prowess but to prophets directing the Greeks to fetch the boy from Scyros. In the opening of the Theban dithyramb his suggestion that *σχοινοτένεια* contrasts a line of processional singers with a choir grouped round the altar deserves careful attention.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

THE PHAETHON OF EURIPIDES.

De Euripidis fabula quae Phaëthon inscribitur restituenda. HERMANNUS VOLMER. Pp. 78. Münster: Aschendorff, 1930. Paper.

BEFORE 1885 the *Phaethon* was represented by some twelve short quotations in ancient writers, notably one in which Longinus finds Euripides 'rising above himself' and one about the sinister meaning of the name Apollo, quoted by the Scholia to the *Orestes* and by Macrobius. In that year two large continuous passages of the play, amounting to over 150 lines together, were found on two leaves of a fifth-century palimpsest at Clermont, now Parisinus 107. The writing was difficult, the text careless, and the leaves cut short for binding, so that before the first passage there are 37 ends of lines and after it 35 beginnings, before the second 35 ends and after it 37 beginnings, all too short to be intelligible. Nearly twenty years later Fortune decided to send us some more *Phaethon* on a good papyrus of about the first century, but instead of letting it be

a new passage or a passage covering some of the mutilated beginnings and ends, ironically let it be 35 short lyric lines already given in the Claromontanus palimpsest. The text of the papyrus, deciphered by Rubensohn and edited by Wilamowitz in *Berliner Klassikertexte* V, is closely similar to that of the palimpsest, and sometimes agrees with the first hand of that MS., sometimes with the corrector; which of course is a critical fact of some significance.

Mr. Volmer, in a treatise for the doctorate, has edited the text of all the extant fragments with critical notes and a good and careful commentary. His treatment of the text is cautious and intelligent. His arrangement of the fragments is reasonable. His emendation of v. 177 *τυφλὰς ἐχούσης τὰς φρένας καὶ τῆς τύχης* (ἔχουσι Stob.) seems right, and in 296 *ἀκαπνιώτως ἔχει* (καπνωτουσεῖ cod.) he has adopted the reading which I have long thought right (also Arnim). Another passage, in v. 50,

αἰτοῦ τί χρήξεις ἔν, raises a much-debated point of syntax, and the fact that Mr. Volmer accepts the MS. reading without qualms is a sign of the growing elasticity of the views of scholars. Nauck, on the plain ground that τί is an interrogative, not a relative, approved the improbable emendation λέγ' εἰ τι χρήξεις; Jebb, in an excursus on *El.* 316 ἰστόρει τί σοι φίλον, puts (rightly) a stop after ἰστόρει and decides that a phrase like that before us is bad Greek. Dr. Kennedy in 1874 went further; among all the signs of incompetence that an editor could show he 'knew none more damnable' than to print ἰστόρει τί σοι φίλον as if it meant 'Ask what you like' (*Studia Sophoclea*, p. 69;

Campbell had done so). And now Gerth (*Grammatik* II, p. 517) says it is all right! No doubt in the growth or decay of language interrogatives do slide into relatives, yet I doubt if there is an instance in good fifth-century Greek. Punctuation clears the matter up in *El.* 316; also in *Ion.* 324 (τάλαινά σ' ἡ τεκοῦσα· τίς ποτ' ἦν ἄρα;), *Trach.* 339 (τί δ' ἐστί; τοῦ με τήνδ' ἐφίστασαι βάσιν;). In the *Phaethon* passage, admittedly more difficult, I think I should print αἰτοῦ—τί χρήξεις;—ἔν, 'Ask one thing. What do you wish for?'

Altogether a useful and convenient little book, edited with care and good scholarship.

G. MURRAY.

Oxford.

TWO TEXTS OF XENOPHON.

Xenophontis Expeditio Cyri. Ad optimos codices denuo ab ipso collatos recensuit CAROLUS HUDE. Editio maior. Leipzig: Teubner, 1931. Bound, Rm. 6.80 (unbound, 5.60).

Xenophon, Anabasis. Tome II. (IV.-VII.). Texte établi et traduit par PAUL MASQUERAY. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1931. Paper, 35 fr.

HUDE has discarded the obsolete misnomers *mel.* and *det.* He calls the Paris family c and the Italian f, after their respective heads, *Parisinus* 1640 and *Vaticanus* 1335. The new collations made by both editors have yielded some good results.

As the two families are incessantly in conflict,¹ and it is impossible to know which, if either, is right, two courses are open to an editor. One is followed by Masqueray, the other by Hude. Thus M. says: 'C reste toujours la source principale, mais lorsque les MSS. de la seconde famille s'en écartent, toutes les fois que leurs leçons sont plausibles, l'éditeur doit les mentionner en note.' On the other hand,

¹ Take VI. v. 13, for example: c has ὅτι βουλῆς οὐκ ἄξιον εἶναι εἰ διαβατέον ἐστί τοιοῦτο νόμος: f runs ὅτι οὐκ ἄξιον εἶναι διαβαίνειν τοιοῦτον ὅν τὸ νόμος. (Here M. says that εἰ of C is missing in BAE. Both editors rely on Dindorf's statements, and they are constantly wrong. The εἰ is in E.)

a bold and self-reliant editor may print in the text whatever he thinks the best version, be it that of c or f or a combination of both. This is what Hude, assisted by the papyrus fragments and the indirect tradition, has done; and consequently his text is nothing short of revolutionary. He has deposed C from its long-established pre-eminence. Even for its earlier readings (many of which are concealed beneath smudges) he has no special regard. Thus in III. i. 21 the MSS. have ὑποψία, but 'in lit. C praeter accentum et a.' Formerly Hude conjectured ἀπορία. M. prints this conjecture, and I have long been convinced that it is right. But in H.'s text ὑποψία is kept, with the modest footnote 'ἀπορία coniecti.' Occasionally I think H. betrays an unconscious prejudice against the earlier hand of C.

The readings ascribed by Hude to D are not always right, and to correct and complete his apparatus he needs many unrecorded readings² from E. In III. iv. 22 the text and note (ἀνεξεπείρασαν) should change places. IV. vii. 16 ἐνεμον is E, not A. At VII. iii. 39 something is wrong with 'Αθηναίαν.

M.'s terse and elegant translation is occasionally in conflict with his text (IV. ii. 20, iii. 1, v. 18; VI. i. 17 and 23). Errors in apparatus: IV. iv.

² I have these.

12 οἱ ἄλλοι (as Hude says) *omnes*; v. 5 τὸ πῦρ *omnes*. At IV. viii. 27 it is a libel on C to attribute to it the feeble ἕτεροι καὶ. V. ii. 14 ἅμα τε E; V. iii. 6 no MS. has αὐτῶ; VII. vi. 9 ἐνθα δέ τε E, and in 10 BF should be BE; VII. vii. 26 κατεργασάμενον E. Misprints in text: IV. iv. 7 and 15, vii. 21; V. vii. 2, viii. 4 and 26.

Both books, strangely as they differ,

are admirable. Hude's text almost always commands assent, and is by far the best available, though I cannot approve his version of II. iv. 26 and IV. ii. 14; nor does the august name of Madvig convince me that τῶν τέ του Μένωνος σ. καὶ τῶν του Κλεάρχου can be what X. intended at I. v. 11.

E. C. MARCHANT.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

GERMAN WORKS ON GREEK PHILOSOPHY.

Der Möglickeitsgedanke. Von AUGUST FAUST. Two volumes. Pp. 460 and 356. Heidelberg: Winter, 1931 and 1932. Paper, M. 17.50 and 13.50 (bound, 20 and 16).

THE first volume of this massive work investigates the conception of potentiality in ancient thought. The longest sections are devoted to Aristotle and Plotinus. The author includes in his reference the whole question of causation; he deals thoroughly with the Aristotelian *δύναμις* in both its metaphysical and its logical bearings, and with the conception of the First Mover. On the Epicureans and Stoics, problems of free will and necessity are taken into account. The most valuable part of the book is the study of Plotinus. Here the author goes into great detail; he insists on the importance of the psychological approach, and of the "mystical" and symbolic elements in Plotinus' system.

The second part of the treatise traces the conception through Christian philosophy as far as Nicholas of Cusa. Here the influences of Plotinus and Aristotle are duly considered. An admirably full index covers the two parts together; from the point of view of classical readers it is a pity that the table of references to ancient authors, which applies almost exclusively to the first volume, is also postponed to the end of the second.

Sokrates. Von CONSTANTIN RITTER. Pp. 87. Tübingen: Laupp, 1931. Paper, M. 2.60.

THE author's established views upon Socrates are here reproduced in a short book intended to meet the needs of

young students. Within the limits indicated, the work could hardly have been better done. The treatment is neither elementary nor superficial; critical analysis is worked in, in due proportion, with the outlines of a constructive portrait. Dr. Ritter discredits Xenophon as a source, and frankly goes to Plato for reliable evidence on the life and personal traits of Socrates. As to doctrine, he offers an outline of ethical and religious teaching, doubts the tradition of a formulated logical method, and rejects outright the ascription to Socrates of any philosophical theories. An appendix gives further valuable criticism on a number of points. The whole work is a masterly achievement in brief; and as a study and appreciation of the personality of Socrates it deserves to be widely known.

Platonische Liebe. Von CONSTANTIN RITTER. Pp. 92. Tübingen: Laupp, 1931. Paper, M. 2.60.

THE greater part of this volume consists of a translation of the *Symposium*. The rendering is literal and at the same time readable; the German construction lends itself particularly well to conveying the continued oblique narration, which in English is likely to be either lost sight of or over-emphasised. In an explanatory essay Dr. Ritter enlarges on the whole topic of *ἔρως* as conceived by Plato. He maintains that here we have to do with an essentially spiritual impulse (among interesting parallels cited are Goethe's *Faust* and St. Paul's conception of *ἀγάπη*), and he is at pains to defend Plato's moral soundness both of precept and of practice. A final chapter expresses friendly

disagreement with the 'mystical' line of interpretation followed by R. Laderborg in his book with the same title. Indexes add to the value of a work both characteristic and worthy of its author. The book is excellently printed in a modernised German type; but the page is too large for single-column setting.

Studien zur Entwicklung der platonischen Dialoge. Von JULIUS STENZEL. Second (enlarged) edition. Pp. 208. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1931. Cloth, Rm. 12 (unbound, 10).

THE greater part of this volume is a reprint, without alteration, of the contents of the first edition (1917)—the long essay entitled 'Arete und Diaeresis' and the brief but important treatise 'Literarische Form und philosophischer Gehalt.' Three more papers (reprinted from periodicals) are now added. The first of these discusses the logic of Socrates, and argues (mainly from the *Phaedrus*) that he should be credited with an ontological theory. The second is a valuable study of the poetic and religious elements in Plato's thought and expression, with a wise insistence all through upon historic circumstance and background. The last article considers in detail the problem of free will in the Platonic system, and finds a satisfactory theory implied, though not explicitly worked out, in the metaphysical and psychological doctrine of the dialogues. Dr. Stenzel's attitude is sane and moderate, and his work is suggestive throughout.

Platons Stellung zur Geschichte. Von GÜNTER ROHR. Pp. 128. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1932. Paper, Rm. 5.

THIS study of Plato's attitude to history centres upon *Laws* III, and begins with a detailed analysis and exposition of that book. This part contains much that is valuable. The author, while expressing general indebtedness to the work of Dr. England, differs from his interpretation at a number of points. Book IV is more briefly summarised; and the whole section is then examined for evidence upon Plato's standpoint and method. The author's conclusion (supported by reference to relevant

passages in the *Republic* and elsewhere) is that Plato's treatment of history is consistent with his general position. He starts with the postulate of eternal principles; and, in order to exhibit these at work, he freely selects from past or present happenings, and as freely introduces 'myth' in the guise of historic narrative. He uses history, in short, as a means to his philosophic end. Dr. Rohr considers, at the same time, Plato's relation and indebtedness to tradition and the historians, and makes a particularly interesting comparison of his outlook with that of Thucydides. While portions of the latter half of the book might have been more simply and more clearly written, the whole is a well-conceived piece of work and a useful contribution to the study of this subject.

Studien zu Sextus Empiricus. Von WERNER HEINTZ. Pp. 299. Halle (Saale): Niemeyer, 1932. Paper, Rm. 18.

THIS book is issued practically as the author left it, prepared for publication, on his death in 1921; the editor has added some references to more recent literature, a few notes of his own and a brief index. Dr. Heintz had been engaged for many years in the study of Sextus; Mutschmann, in the second volume (1914) of the Teubner edition, recognises the value of his work and records in the *apparatus* a number of his opinions. The present book makes Mutschmann's text the basis for consideration, though referring to Bekker's pagination. The notes vary greatly in length and importance, ranging from mere records of conjecture or comparison to such prolonged discussions as that on the vexed passage 238. 5. The author is usually cautious in his critical method; his suggestions are in most cases supported by clear and reasonable argument. A good specimen is the note upholding ἀριθμός in place of ἀθροισμός at 536. 5. Apart from the merits of particular readings, the book will prove an indispensable companion to the study of this little-annotated writer. D. TARRANT.

Bedford College,
University of London.

THE PLATONIC EPISTLES.

The Platonic Epistles. Translated with Introduction and Notes by J. HARWARD. Pp. ix+244. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 15s.

THE Platonic Letters have been by no means neglected in the last ten years. In 1923 E. Howald published a German translation of VI, VII, and VIII, the only three which he believed genuine, together with a general introduction to the whole collection; in 1925 L. A. Post gave us a complete English translation, with a short introduction and commentary; in 1926 appeared J. Souilhé's edition in the Budé series; and in 1930 F. Novotný produced a large-scale commentary. It would have been possible to give a warmer welcome to the present work if Novotný's edition had not so recently preceded it; nevertheless English readers should be glad to have, under one cover, a full and attractively written account of the period of Sicilian history with which the more important letters are concerned, a readable and, for the most part, faithful translation, and a commentary which, if by no means exhaustive, yet squarely faces the main difficulties of interpretation and deals reasonably with the question of the authenticity of each letter.

Mr. Harward regards all the letters (except of course I) as genuine. Many readers will be sorry that he has not rejected II, the only letter of any substance about which there can be much doubt left nowadays. In his controversy with Mr. Post about its date, if genuine, I think the probabilities are with Mr. Post; but, as pointed out by G. C. Field, each seems more successful in attacking the opposite view than in substantiating his own. Why should Plato have told Dionysius to read this letter over and over again, and then burn it? Mr. Harward offers no suggestion on this. A fairly obvious explanation, which may have been given already, is that the author of II was anticipating the criticism that this letter was not to be found amongst Dionysius' papers. As to the notorious sentence at 314c with its mention of *Σωκράτους καλοῦ καὶ νέου γεγονότος*, I still cannot see why Plato should have

thus described the Socrates of the dialogues.

I have tested the translation of XIII, VIII, and a small part of VII, and note some apparent inaccuracies. XIII 360D *φαύλου* means 'of a uniform character' (see Novotný, *ad loc.*), not 'to be despised.' *Ibid.* *μάλιστα μὲν* (followed by *εἰ δὲ μή*) is, as regularly, used not of the more important but of the more desirable of two alternatives. 362C *ὅτι ἂν οἴωνται ἀνάλωμα εἰσαγγέλλειν* means 'whatever they think involves expense,' not 'any expenditure which they think it suitable to propose,' a rendering which mistranslates *εἰσαγγέλλειν* and requires the addition of *πρέπειν*. 363E *τῶν πεμπομένων* is surely neuter. *Ibid.* in *ὁ αὐτὸς ἴσθι* the article (omitted by A) should probably be deleted, and the words translated 'keep the knowledge of it to yourself.' VIII 354B *σωτήριον* means 'preservative of,' not 'salutary,' as the following clause shows. 354C in *εἰς βασιλέως εἶδος μεταβάλλειν* the verb is intransitive, as is clear from the parallel phrase at 356B *εἰς βασιλέως σχῆμα ἀπαλλάττεσθαι*: hence it is misleading to translate 'to change the constitution to a limited monarchy.' 355C *χρῆσθαι νόμῳ* means not to 'follow' a law, but merely to have one (whether you follow it or not). 356B *τὰς τύχας*, not 'the despot's doom' but 'turns of fortune.' VII 342E *οὐχ ἦττον = μᾶλλον*, and must be so translated. 342E and 343B *τὸ ποῖόν τι* does not mean either 'a quality' or 'what a thing is like,' but 'a something qualified.' 342B and 343B *ὀνομάτων* is rather 'nouns' than 'names.' 343B the subject of *βεβαίως εἶναι* is not *οὐδέν*, but *τὸ ὄνομα* (or *τὰ ὀνόματα*), and *οὐδὲν ἦττον = nihilo minus*.

In the note on VIII 357C 2 it is rightly pointed out that the sentence, as it stands, cannot refer to the future, as most translators suppose. But the resulting interpretation is inconsistent with Mr. Harward's belief (which I share) that Plato wrote this letter after Dion's son had died, but without knowing of his death. For how could he believe that Dion's son and his nephew were already in agreement except as

the result of information to that effect from Sicily? And yet any such information is *ex hypothesi* impossible. The remedy, I think, is to insert an *ἄν*, probably after *οἶμαι*.

In note 17 on II 'Adams' should be 'Adam,' and in note 3 on IX 'Antiphon' should be 'Antiphanes.' The remarks on Cicero as a witness to the genuineness of the letters made on

p. 78 hardly tally with those made on p. 60. In the latter neighbourhood one misses the name of Thrasyllus, and wonders why the date of Diogenes Laertius should be given as c. A.D. 100. But these are small points, and do not substantially impair the value of a useful and, in the main, careful book.

R. HACKFORTH.

Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

VOLUME III OF THE OXFORD DEMOSTHENES.

Demosthenis Orationes. Tomus III. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit W. RENNIE. Pp. xvi+435. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931. Cloth, 6s.

A NOTICE of volume II, part II, appeared in the CLASSICAL REVIEW at the end of 1922; unhappily the reviewer who wrote it did not live to see the appearance of volume III, but many of his more general comments are applicable to it.

Comparison is naturally challenged with the fourth Teubner edition, Dindorf's text revised by Blass. Mr. Rennie rarely differs from it on important points, though, according to my notes, which are not exhaustive, he has printed or proposed over sixty emendations of his own, accepted rather less often other scholars' proposals not adopted by Blass, and over a hundred times followed the authority of MSS., inscriptions or papyri, which the German editor rejected or had not available. Mr. Rennie is not obsessed by the virtues of Augustanus A, and even in the more finished speeches is ready to admit readings and make conjectures which involve hiatus or a run of several short syllables.

In the perhaps minor matter of use of elision and *ν ἐφελκυστικόν* he differs from Blass on the average several times a page. Blass does not appear consistent throughout, but in Mr. Rennie's text apparent inconsistencies of the following type are frequent:

XLIX 56 οὔτε ὥς . . . οὔθ' ὥς: L 38 ἀναλώματα ἀπεδίδου, 40 ἀναλώματ' ἀποδοῦναι: LVIII 46 ἐγράψατο ἄν . . . ἐγράψατ' ἄν: LIX 16 τοῦτο ὑμῖν, 17 τοῦθ' ὑμῖν: LII 11 μὴ θέλῃσι,

Pro. XLIX 1 προσεῖναι ἐθελόντας: XLIX 28 συνέστησεν τὸν πατέρα, 29 συνέστησε τὸν Φιλώνδαν: LIX 62 ἔστιν ξένη, 63 ἔστι ξένη.

In his use also of crasis, and deictic iota, of οὔτω and οὕτως, οἶμαι and οἴομαι, αὐτὸν and ἐαυτόν, ἄν and ἑάν, ἔνεκα and εἵνεκα, πλεόν and πλεῖν, ἐώρακεν and ἐώραται, and other alternative forms, the editor does not make it easy for the reader to see what principles he followed. It is true that the question is complicated through the different types of composition, by Demosthenes and other authors, which are included in this volume, but guidance might be hoped for from an Oxford text. Are we to believe that speakers indulged in variety of forms even in the same section, and if so that on such a point the perhaps conscientious but certainly incompetent barbarian who wrote S is a good authority for what his elders and betters said?

On the other hand Mr. Rennie has frequently referred to Meisterhans and other external authorities successfully to justify forms not found in some or even in any of the MSS. He also gives a wealth of references to parallel passages in literature, not only oratorical, but philosophical, historical and poetic; and these, though they can hardly give conclusive proof, often help to establish a reading.

Among wrong references in the apparatus may be noted:

XLVIII *Arg.* § 5 l. 9 κλήρου for '34' read '32 et 33.'

XLVIII § 45 l. 3 ἀνθρωπος for '55' read '50.'

XLIX § 19 l. 28 κυρίαν for '24' read '84.'

XLIX § 65 l. 19 ἐγὼ for '23' read '22.'

LVI § 25 l. 24 τιμὰς τὰς for '9' read '10.'

LX § 14 l. 10 ἐν for '37' read '39.'

The apparatus is often obscure through brevity and inconsistency. 'syll. ult. per compend. sscr.' is the somewhat alarming note on XLII 12 10; it is not only in S that abbreviations may give trouble. Very often the MSS. reading is given, but not the source of the correction which appears in the text. As the *editio minor* of Blass 'has hitherto been current in England', it is perhaps a pity that we are not told what 'Blass' means in the apparatus; in at least twenty places it is printed after readings not found in that edition. 'Recte puto' in the earlier part of the volume—e.g. XLII 16 13-14, XLIX 19 28—seems to indicate acceptance for the text; abruptly the courage of his convictions fails the editor—e.g. L 49 25, LVII 47 3, LVIII 61 9, LIX 51 8. Sometimes a note is given without indication of its purpose—e.g. LV 17 14 '(neque αὐτὸ neque mox ἐγκαλέσει habet S in mg.)', and 29 1 'non om. S'. 'Supra' and 'infra' are often printed, where a numerical reference would have been clearer. In a note to LI information is given about 'A a' and 'A b', but what does 'A' mean in notes to this speech? Sometimes readings are quoted inaccurately—e.g. XLIX 42 3 Blass reads α τ', not α τε, LVI 12 11 πρὸς λόγον, not τὸ πρὸς λόγον, is the reading in the Argument, *Pro.* XXXIII 2 18 <δντ> not <δντα> is what Mr. Rennie prints in his own text. On L 2 19 we read 'ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἅπαντα A sicut XLVII 3', and when we turn to this reference we find a note on the previous section 'hic desinit codex A'. On LVII 67 3 is given the note 'in lacuna § 21 quaerendus', but the poor relation is afforded not even this damp asylum in the text.

There are many small inaccuracies, 'nescio an typhothetae errore'. The numbers of sections are often misplaced or omitted. The headings of the last pages of speeches are inconsistent, and the printer seems to doubt

the authenticity of the end of XLV. I noted about forty misprints, the commonest being the omission of accents in the apparatus. It may be worth quoting the following: XLVIII heading ΟΑΤΜΗΠΙΟΔΩΡΟΤ, 46 ταυτονι, LIII 16 κατάξαιμι (surely no one would expect that even an angry gardener would be so violent), LIX 37 Δακεδαιμονίων, 105 δήπου (a perverted form of democracy), LX 28 ἡροῦνθ' ἦ. On the first page of *Ep.* I several accents are lost. Finally in the first of the list of corrigenda 'in adnotatione critica' (p. xv) we are instructed to read what is already correctly printed in the note referred to.

But the volume is disfigured not only by misprints but by bad printing. Nearly every page has several examples of letters apparently belonging to a slightly heavier fount, and mutilated or misplaced letters are not uncommon.

Some of the passages where interesting differences from Blass are printed or suggested are XLIII 57, XLVII 20, XLVIII Arg. 3, L 52, LI 10, 12, 22 (surely wrongly), LII Arg. 2, LIII 2, LIV 40, LV 34, LVI 30, 42, LVII 20, LVIII 18, LIX 22, 108, LXI 54, *Pro.* XXXVII 1. Often Mr. Rennie's own inspection of MSS. has had good results—e.g. XLV 74, LIII 11; and the Papyrus evidence used for *Ep.* III is instructive.

It is disappointing that the reader of this text should be so constantly irritated by details, individually perhaps for the most part trifling, but cumulatively a serious shortcoming in the edition.

One or two very modest suggestions which occurred to the reviewer may perhaps be added:

XLVIII 58 16. The passage seems to run more smoothly if ὑμᾶς is deleted.

LV 24 22. αὐτή.

LVII 68 11. Put ταύτης . . . μαρτυροῦσιν; in inverted commas, to match beginning of § 67.

LIX 124 25-26. Reduce βλαφθείσαν and βλαβείσαν to consistency.

LX 31 7. ποιούντας.

Pro. XXIV 4 14. αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἡμᾶς.

A. N. BRYAN-BROWN.

Worcester College, Oxford.

THE BUDÉ LYCURGUS.

Lycurgue, contre Léocrate et Fragments.
Texte établi et traduit par FÉLIX
DURRBACH. Pp. lvi+99. Paris:
'Les Belles Lettres,' 1932. Paper,
25 francs.

MONSIEUR FÉLIX DURRBACH, the editor of the present volume, which is a valuable addition to the Budé series, published many years ago the standard life of the orator (*L'Orateur Lycurge*: Paris, 1889). He died before the present volume appeared.

The first part of the book contains a very full Introduction dealing with (I.) The Life of Lycurgus, (II.) His Administration, (III.) His Speeches, (IV.) The Text. Then follow sections dealing with biographical material, the Pseudo-Plutarchian Life of Lycurgus, the Decree of Stratocles, and eight other inscriptions, and the testimony of ancient authors. Students are thus provided with all that they can possibly require about the life and times of Lycurgus set forth in a clear and attractive form. The least satisfactory section is that dealing with the characteristics of Lycurgus as an orator; in particular, more might have been said of the influence of Isocrates on his pupil.

The text of Lycurgus depends on two MSS., one in the British Museum and the other at Oxford, which are derived from the same archetype. The editor's collation of these MSS. has confirmed the accuracy of the text of Blass; but he is certainly right in following the MSS. in certain passages where Blass has made unnecessary changes to avoid *hiatus* and from consideration of the *numeri*.

The translation is adequate and readable, though it sometimes tends to paraphrase.

Space forbids a full discussion of details, but a few brief comments may be made:

§ 9. *περιείλφε ἐνὶ ὀνόματι*: read *περιείλφεν*.

§ 18. *τριήρεις πληρώσαντες τὰ πλοῖα κατήγον*, which D. translates 'ils armerent des trières pour mettre l'embargo sur nos navires marchands,' surely

means simply, 'they manned their vessels of war and called into harbour their merchant-ships.' (Jebb, *Attic Orators*, II. 378, also mistranslates this passage, 'they told off crews for their triremes and set about launching the vessels.')

§ 45. Dobree's *μηδὲ συνεξευγκείν* (MSS. *συνεγκείν*) gives better sense than D.'s *μηδὲν συνεισευγκείν*.

§ 65. D. is certainly right in retaining the MS. reading *νόμων*, which Blass emends to *νομίμων*.

§ 80. *ἰσχος* (MSS. *ἰσχῶς*) . . . *τῆς ἐκείνων ἀρετῆς* is a strange phrase; the right reading is probably *ἰσχύς* in its not uncommon sense of 'motive power.'

§ 86. *κατὰ τὰς πύλας ὑπεκδύντα*: the MS. reading *ὑποδύντα* should be retained; *ὑποδύνω* is used in exactly the same sense in [Dem.] in *Aristogiti*. § 28.

§ 100. In the *ῥήσις* from Eur. *Erechtheus*, D. is certainly right in reading *σθένει* (Blass *στένει*) in l. 20; <ῥ> φύσει for <τῇ> φύσει (Blass) in l. 38; and *τῇνδ' ἐγώ* for *τῇνδε δ' οὐ* (Blass) in l. 42.

§ 119. D. rightly retains the MS. reading *ἐκόλασαν* where Blass reads *κολάσαι*.

§ 123. *τοὺς ἐπιχειρήσαντας* . . . *ἀποστερεῖν οὕτως ἐκόλασαν*: *ἀποστερεῖν* requires an object, and Reiske is probably right in reading *ἀποστερεῖν* <ἐαυτοὺς> οὕτως κ.τ.λ.

§ 129. *πᾶσιν ἐπίσημον ἐποίησαν τῇ τιμωρίᾳ ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*: the MS. reading *τὴν τιμωρίαν* should be retained; it exemplifies a common idiom with words such as *δῆλος*: cp. Plato, *Crito*, 44D, *αὐτὰ δὲ δῆλα τὰ παρόντα νυνί, ὅτι οἱ οἱ τ' εἰσιν οἱ πολλοὶ τὰ μέγιστα κακὰ ἐργάζεσθαι*.

εἰκότως οὐδὲν γὰρ πρότερον ἀδικοῦσιν ἢ περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἀσεβοῦσι κ.τ.λ. is rendered by D. 'Rien de plus juste, leur crime étant, avant tout, une impiété qui prive les dieux de leur culte héréditaire.' The right meaning seems to be 'and rightly; for as soon as they commit a crime (of treason), they are acting impiously towards the gods by depriving them of their traditional rights.'

§ 131. D. renders *καὶ τοῖς ἀλόγοις ζῴοις* . . . *διείληπται* by 'qui ont été

répartis, comme des biens essentiels éminemment nécessaires, même entre les animaux dépourvus de raison'; it would seem rather to mean 'the great importance and significance of which

has been apprehended even by the unreasoning animals.'

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

University of Sheffield.

ALEXANDER THE GREAT.

Alexander the Great. By ULRICH WILCKEN; translated by G. C. RICHARDS. Pp. ix+337; frontispiece and map. London: Chatto and Windus, 1932. Boards, 15s.

The Ephemerides of Alexander's Expedition. By CHARLES ALEXANDER ROBINSON, JR. Pp. 81; frontispiece and map. (Brown University Studies.) Providence: Brown University, 1932. Boards, \$3.

It was a happy idea to translate Professor Wilcken's *Alexander der Grosse* (1931), for it is much the best life of Alexander which has appeared in Germany. Canon Richards may be congratulated on his translation, which is good and scholarly and reads easily; only occasionally are we conscious that we are reading a translation, and he deserves every credit for not reproducing the italics so freely employed in the original. The index has been amplified and a frontispiece added, a successful enlargement of one of the most beautiful of the Alexander-heads on Lysimachus' money. I wish it had been possible to give the gist of all of Wilcken's not too numerous notes, instead of a selection; but the translator has himself added some valuable notes and recent references, distinguished by square brackets. I have noticed very few errors; I give them, as they may be useful for a second edition. The notes on pp. 43, 291 are really Wilcken's, those on pp. 158, 326 really Richards'; that on p. 279 has gone wrong somehow (correct in Wilcken); that on p. 248 should be '(Kaerst) and Radet,' for both put forward the idea independently in the same year. In the text: p. 3, 'not yet reached his thirty-third year' should be 'the age of thirty-three'; p. 289, 'Philadelphus himself set foot' should be 'P. got a footing'; p. 316, 'from the beginning (of the third century)' should be 'from

the end.' The mistake on p. 213, 'as son of Zeus or as Poseidon' (for 'of Poseidon'), reproduces a slip in the German. The many excellences of Wilcken's book deserve to be widely known, and I wish Canon Richards a large circle of readers.

Nearly three-quarters of Professor Robinson's book consists of a table, taken from our five secondary sources and set out in parallel columns, of the places Alexander visited. He assumes without discussion that every place mentioned must be from the *Journal*, and puts forward a theory that, as the five agree down to 327 (death of Callisthenes), the common source here must be Callisthenes using the *Journal*; then follows a period of disagreement, owing to the *Journal* being no longer available to historians (he argues from an absurd story in Plutarch's *Eumenes* that it was burnt in India); subsequently they agree again, showing that the *Journal* was again available, but through what intermediary he does not say. Certainly there are one or two misplacements in his middle period, but nothing comparable to one in the first period, which he has not noticed: the vulgate writers, as against Arrian and Plutarch, put the foundation of Alexandria after the visit to Ammon, to make out that it was founded by a god. This alone seems conclusive against his Callisthenes theory. Further, if the *Journal* was burnt, how came Strattis of Olynthus to write on it (though not five books, as he says; they were on Alexander's death)? He gets over Strattis by saying that, as Olynthus never revived after 348, he was a contemporary of Alexander; but the evidence given by Hiller on Ditt.³ 751 proves that Olynthus did revive, and I understand that some objects found in the excavations are really Hellenistic; Strattis may be

anywhere over three centuries. One welcomes any attempt to elucidate the *Journal* or any one of its numerous

problems; but I fear that, though the table is of value, this book otherwise adds little to our knowledge.

W. W. TARN.

THE GREEK WORLD AFTER ALEXANDER.

A History of the Greek World from 323 to 146 B.C. By M. CARY. Pp. xiv+448 and 3 maps. London: Methuen, 1932. Cloth, 15s.

THIS is the first volume to appear of a new *History of the Greek and Roman World*, in seven volumes, under Dr. Cary's general editorship. The aim of the series, I understand, is to reach readers who desire an authoritative work embodying modern research, but something shorter and less detailed than the *Cambridge Ancient History*; and if all the volumes are up to the standard of this one it should achieve its aim. It was a good idea that the editor should take the Hellenistic volume himself, as one gets the point of view of a fresh mind on the subject; and, while intended primarily for the general reader, there is plenty in the book which will also profit the expert. Cary sums up, very justly, that without the study of Hellenistic history the general pattern of Greek history cannot be fully perceived and appreciated; and his book should remove the last excuse for anyone, if there still be anyone, who thinks that the way to understand Greek history is to omit half of it from his reading.

The book falls into two halves, history and civilisation. Down to the entry of Rome the history is treated, not by reigns, but by territorial divisions; this involves bisecting some wars and kings, but they are the least important part of the matter, and probably on balance the arrangement justifies itself. I doubt if there be any known way of making third-century history perfectly easy for the general reader to follow; it is so intertangled that any arrangement must rely on the reader's willingness to co-operate. I do not think Cary's territorial arrangement should present any difficulty, and there are plenty of cross-references; but it might have been worth while to prefix a brief preliminary outline of the dynasties, though of

course the reader can find them for himself in the appended genealogical tables. That the history itself is adequately treated, having regard to the space, goes without saying; the sections on the Third Syrian War and the mistakes which ultimately ruined Philip V are notably good, and it is properly emphasised that throughout the third century Greece was of more importance for history than Asia or Egypt, and that the so-called decadence of the Greek East later on was largely due to Rome having broken men's spirit. I feel myself that, in some places, the delineation has been kept on rather a low plane, as though the writer had caught that lack of enthusiasm which he finds characteristic of Hellenistic literature; some of the people, I think, were bigger than he makes them. But on this opinions will always differ.

For the second part of the book, the civilisation, I have nothing but praise; the reader will obtain a good picture of this strangely modern world—it is a feat to have got so much of the essentials into the space—and there are some points which, at least to the present reviewer, are quite new. The subjects treated include warcraft, the monarchies, the cities, economic life (with a particularly lucid account of banking), art, literature, science, philosophy, and religion. My principal query is whether the reader will see what it was that made Stoicism such a force; it seems hardly possible to explain it in two pages. Some may think there is too little about Egypt; but there are several recent accounts available now in English, and I think Cary is absolutely justified in keeping Egypt to scale, which is how contemporaries must have seen it.

There are sixteen appendices; that on the First Syrian War, where Mr. Sidney Smith has helped, is a model handling of a thorny subject. In App. 2 the numbers in the MSS. of Diodorus

XVIII, 10—200 quadriremes and 40 triremes—are not tenable in face of the Athenian dockyard lists (undoubtedly they have got reversed, as usually supposed); and in App. 4 *τρίηρεις* in Diod. XX, 47 is not 'triremes' but 'warships,' a common Hellenistic use. Ampelone

on the map differs from its location on p. 81. There is a good index and a useful selected bibliography; Dinsmoor's great *Athenian Archons*, important for Athenian history, appeared too late for inclusion.

W. W. TARN.

THE LAST WORD IN HISTORY.

The History of World Civilisation. By HERMANN SCHNEIDER. Translated by MARGARET M. GREEN. Vol. I. Pp. xiv + 908. London: George Routledge, 1931. 42s. net.

WHEN this book, by the Professor of Philosophy at Leipzig, was published in Germany in 1927 it was hailed, we are told, by the *Preussische Jahrbücher* as 'perhaps the most significant achievement since Spengler.' Vol. I, now translated, and printed in two stout volumes, deals with antiquity: palaeolithic and neolithic man, and all the ancient civilisations, with a long appendix on India and China. A second volume is to describe modern European civilisations, the peoples who 'took up the great problems of human civilisation anew at the point where the Greeks and Romans had left them, worked them out finally, and solved them.' When I read in the preface: 'The individual develops from a child to an adult and grows old, and there is a corresponding process in the life of a people,' I reflected that this theory is certainly not novel, and probably not true (as a simile, it may be useful enough); and that if it is true, an explanation of its cause and an account of the process would be much more interesting than the mere establishing of the fact. When I read further that 'to present the history of man as an evolutionary process . . . is a duty; we are faced with a scientific problem which must be solved scientifically'; and that 'it is the mission of our epoch to bring this general evolutionary survey of human civilisation to scientific completion. Great quantities of the material upon which the history of world civilisation is based have been gathered; people are weary of collecting such material and are demanding a

final survey,' I could only wonder at the continued illusions of mortal men, who believe each that their own generation has not only finally solved practical problems, but can complete the survey of the past.

But Professor Schneider has not even contributed much that is of value to such a survey. His errors of fact are numerous, far too numerous to quote here; but his errors of method are more important. His two principal theses, which give unity to his theme, are, first, that a new racial mixture is a necessary preliminary for every fresh development of culture, and that the stages of this development can be precisely dated: after the mixture 'five or six centuries of silent growth to maturity and the absorption of earlier cultural treasure' (the childhood of the people); then 'the great classic geniuses appear,' and after eighty or a hundred years, this early period, the 'first prime' (corresponding to the youth of man), is past; a century of revolution always follows this; and finally there is a second prime (comparable to manhood), springing 'from a belief in progress coupled with critical reflection on the limitations of man's all too human nature, from the spread of new ideas to wider circles, from the creative work of scholars and artists and from civic conflicts.' After about a thousand years from the first racial mixture the people becomes 'senile and uncreative.' His second main thesis is that there was a uniform neolithic culture all over Northern and Central Europe, with a solar religion (the god dying and being reborn yearly), and that *all* ancient civilisations, from Sumerian to Roman, are derived directly from the mixture of these neolithic people of Europe with the indigenous inhabitants of Mesopo-

tamia and the Mediterranean regions; who came in two principal waves, the pre-Indo-Germans (who produced the Assyrian, Babylonian, Egyptian, Jewish, Hittite and Cretan cultures) and the Indo-Germans (classical Greece and Rome).

This second thesis Professor Schneider would prove by the process of ignoring, arbitrarily selecting, and distorting evidence, in the good old fashion. As to the first, even if it could be proved, the most interesting problem would remain unsolved, namely why one racial mixture produced Babylon, another Greece (especially if the most important element in every ancient racial mixture was the neolithic people with a uniform culture); for that an analysis of the mixture, now impossible, would be essential. But Professor Schneider nowhere attempts to prove it; in every case, in a very brief statement, he assumes it by postulating unproved dates or facts. Thus the first Cretan prime was about 1900 B.C.; therefore 'the immigrant peoples whose intermarriage with the indigenous inhabitants was the source of the earliest Cretan civilisation must have appeared on the island about 2500-2400 B.C.' Classical Greece was the result of two waves of new immigrants (the first Indo-Germans), the Achaeans and the Dorians. Homer and Hesiod represent the prime of the first in the eighth century; therefore the Achaeans 'must have' arrived in the thirteenth. Athens c. 500-420 is the first prime of the second racial mixture; therefore the Dorian invasion, of the eleventh century, 'must have been' as effective in Attica as in the Peloponnese, the fourth century is the revolutionary period (while the 'older mixed race,' that of Homer, was in its second prime), the next two (c. 320-150) the second prime. Alexander's conquests lead to a new racial mixture; so the period 200 (or 150) to 300 A.D. is the prime of a new race. Latium was

settled by the new Italic peoples (who all, by the way, practised cremation, and whose language was 'nearest akin to Greek') in the eighth century; therefore the first prime of Rome must be 250-150 B.C., the revolutionary period 150-50, 50 B.C.-150 A.D. the second prime. South Italy was colonised by the Greeks by 700 B.C.; therefore by 200 B.C. they had 'reached cultural maturity', at the same time as the Romans. And apart from the method: what is the value of calling the age of Thucydides, Plato and Aristotle revolutionary, that of Callimachus and Archimedes a second prime? of equating the fourth century in Greece with the period 150-50 B.C. in Rome (which, indeed, though revolutionary in politics, was not in culture)? It leads to remarkable judgments, such as: 'if we may liken Scipio I (Africanus) to Themistocles and Scipio II (Aemilianus) to Pericles, then the great pretenders of the revolutionary period may be said roughly to correspond to Alcibiades and Pausanias. But they, living in outworn Athens and Sparta [why outworn? Alcibiades is just after the youth of the nation, before its second prime; and Pausanias?], accomplished nothing creative; that was left to Alexander the Macedonian. In Rome, on the contrary, the march of evolution continued unbroken.' Professor Schneider says of Jewish history before Ezra and Nehemiah: 'What we have here is not history but speculations on the philosophy of history which naturally dominated all the records even of the historical period proper. What mattered to these "historians" was not how things actually happened, but how events could be turned to account to prove the fundamental, supreme doctrine of their philosophy.' This is precisely his own method; why pretend that it is scientific, or that its conclusions are final?

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

THE WALL OF REPUBLICAN ROME.

Le Mura di Roma repubblicana. By GÖSTA SÄFLUND. Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom. I. Pp. xii + 278; with 28 plates, 1 general plan, and 72 illustrations in the text. Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1932. Paper.

THE conclusions reached in this book differ in several important respects from those of the most recent writers upon the City Wall of Republican Rome, namely, Frank, *Roman Buildings of the Republic*, 1924, pp. 111-124, and Platner and Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, 1929, pp. 350-355. After attributing to the sixth century B.C. nothing more than a system of defensive earthworks, the author assigns to the year 378 B.C. (Livy VI. 32) the beginning of the construction in Grotta Oscura tufa of a wall round the whole city, including the Aventine, and suggests that the work was carried out not, as Frank supposes, by the Roman army with Veientine captives serving as quarrymen, but by Sicilian engineers trained in the school of Dionysius I. of Syracuse. Moreover, the smallish blocks of grey tufa (*cappellaccio*) found at various points on the line of the Wall, assigned by Platner and Ashby to an original wall built in the sixth century B.C., he regards as later than the construction of 378 B.C.

Moreover, in tracing the probable course of the Wall he displays no less independence of judgment. First, when dealing with the topography of the area between the Capitol and the Aventine he regards all the remains of Republican walling existing at the south-western corner of the Palatine as part of the City Wall itself, and not, as Platner and Ashby consider (*op. cit.*, p. 355), of an internal citadel on the Palatine which continued to be separately fortified. He considers, therefore, that from the Capitol the Wall ran south-east to the Palatine and thence south-west straight across the valley of the Circus Maximus to the north-western edge of the Aventine, a complete departure from the conclusions of those topographers (e.g. Hülsen

and Kiepert; Platner and Ashby) who regarded the Wall as terminated by the eastern bank of the Tiber at points south-west of the Capitol and near the northern extremity of the Aventine. His hypothesis has something in common with the view which has just been put forward by A. von Gerkan in *Röm. Mitt.* XLVI., 1931, pp. 153-188. Secondly, he assigns to the consulship of Cn. Octavius and L. Cornelius Merula (87 B.C.) not only the repairs to the Wall mentioned by Appian (*Bell. Civ.* I. 66, 303), but also the inclusion of the Janiculum within the enceinte of the whole city.

Students of the fascinating problems of the 'Servian' Wall will welcome this conscientious and stimulating book, systematically composed and written in clear and attractive Italian. I may be permitted to commend the meticulous care taken in the description and the illustration of the remains of the Wall, and in particular the invaluable section dealing with the rapidly disappearing quarry marks. The author has also collected and arranged the ancient literary evidence for the Wall's history, and has published Lanciani's notes and rough sketches, bequeathed to the Vatican Library, of fragments no longer existing or accessible.

Two points of criticism may be ventured. I cannot agree that he has made out a convincing case for his theory (pp. 188-190) that the Janiculum was included within the enceinte in 87 B.C., and I feel that the deductions which he draws from the discovery of the Altar of Verminius (p. 157) are not logical.

In brief, this book is admirable and indispensable, not only as a special study, but also as an aid and an inspiration to those who may endeavour to throw light upon the history of Italy during the Roman Republic by the scientific examination of walling. The author has done a notable service to the study of the Wall of Republican Rome; his book is an apt counterpart to Mr. I. A. Richmond's upon the Wall of Imperial Rome.

R. GARDNER.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

THE TERENCE MINIATURES.

The Miniatures of the Manuscripts of Terence prior to the Thirteenth Century. By L. W. JONES and C. MOREY. Princeton University Press (Vol. I printed in Italy). 2 Vols. Vol. I The Plates (796); Vol. II The Text, pp. xi + 241. Vol. I \$20; Vol. II \$12.

THESE are the first two numbers of the series 'Illuminated Manuscripts of the Middle Ages,' published for the Department of Art and Archaeology of Princeton University. Both Princeton University and the authors are to be congratulated on producing, in worthy form, a work which is of great and permanent value in the field of medieval art and for the study of the transmission of classical texts.

We begin with the volume of plates. Hitherto the illustrations which are a feature of certain MSS. of Terence were available to scholars only in part. It is true that the illustrations of P (*Parisinus*), of C (*Vaticanus*) and of F (*Ambrosianus*) had been published separately; but there still remained the need of a complete collection if inquiry was not to be continually baffled by the lack of full evidence. This need has now been met, and met handsomely. Not only are all the miniatures of the thirteen illustrated MSS. (prior to the thirteenth century, when the old tradition made way for Gothic) presented together, but the several illustrations of each Scene are placed (always in the same order) on a single page or on opposite pages, to make comparison easy. And, for the greater convenience of the consultant, a short summary is added of the Scene depicted. Except that the element of colour is absent (the frontispiece alone gives C's portrait of Terence in colours), material almost as good as that of the MSS. themselves is put at the student's disposal in his own library.

Using this collection as evidence, the authors proceed, in Vol. II, to a detailed examination of the miniatures, and draw their conclusions. A comparison of the best illustrations (those of C, P and F) leads to the reconstruction of the original drawings, which, on the

ground of their general style—'the two-dimensional character of the compositions'—and of various minor indications, are dated, with others of their kind, in the beginning of the fifth century. This date, as we shall see, is important in another connexion. Very interesting also, and possibly of increasing significance, is the fact that the style is that known to have made its way into Italy from a Graeco-Asiatic source.

But the similarity between the drawings of C and P, taken together with features in which they differ from those of F, leads to a further conclusion. C and P have been copied, not from the source (γ), but from an intermediary (γ^2) whose particular style, 'closely allied to that of MSS. written and illustrated in Asia Minor in the fifth and sixth centuries,' suggests that the artist 'was trained in the same school that produced the Asiatic MSS. and was probably himself a Greek'; and his date is given as the end of the fifth century. F, on the other hand, shows signs of being closer to the original (γ), and the intermediary (γ^1) is in this case put in the middle of the fifth century. The evidence for these conclusions is highly technical. It is presented clearly and fairly, but the amateur in late Roman and medieval art will not presume to appraise it finally.

Thus the points γ^1 and γ^2 have been fixed, and the authors connect them up with the existing illustrated MSS. of Terence to construct a *stemma* for these MSS. It is interesting to note how strongly, on the whole, the pictures corroborate the witness of the text. But occasionally they do more than that. For instance, they conjure up in the mind's eye an illustrated MS. (γ^3) of the fifth century existing in Corbie in Picardy at the beginning of the ninth century. For C (*Vaticanus*) was written and illustrated in Corbie at that time. Here credit should be given to Morey for his discovery of the artist's signature (ADELRICUS ME FECIT) on the outer edge of the pediment of the *aedicula* of *Andria*. (The reproducing plate cannot, alas, suggest such details.) Scribe

(Hrodgarius) and artist moved from Corbie to Corvey (Westphalia) about 822 A.D. But their work was done before they left Corbie. Thus C's origin is accurately determined as to time and place.

Again, the existence (somewhere in France), between the ninth and the tenth century, of another fifth-century illustrated MS. of Terence is implied by the assumption of a separate archetype for F. This, however, is more doubtful and requires further confirmation.

It is impossible now to discuss the many links established or presumed between individuals of the group of illustrated MSS., but it will be understood that the work done here is of great importance and cannot in future be neglected.

We pass to another subject. We have seen that the original illustrations were attributed to the fifth century. Now these illustrations cannot be dissociated from the Scene-headings which we find in the γ -group of MSS. of Terence.¹ They originated as embellishments of that particular text because they reflect the peculiarities of that text's Scene-headings. That text is identified as the Calliopian text. It follows that the Calliopian text of Terence originated in the fifth century. By this path the authors enter the lists in a notorious controversy. Their reviewer cannot quarrel with the fifth-century dating, because he has contended for it himself.² And confirmation from the pictorial side puts the 'fifth-century' hypothesis in a secure position. But the chapter 'Genealogy of the Terence Manuscripts' is in many ways unsatisfactory. It summarises old theories without ruling out what is definitely wrong. It repeats statements which have long been disproved. For instance, note 47 on page 10 talks of 'the numerous fifteenth-century corrections in A,' which Kauer showed to

be the corrections of Jovialis earlier than the sixth century. Or again, on page 23, Webb is quoted, without remonstrance, as saying that 'at *Heaut.* 606 F does not share with the other members of its group the mistake of *daturum* for *daturam*,' when *daturum* is correct, since in Early Latin -*urum* was the indeclinable form of the Fut. Infin. Act.³

Further, the authors seem to have embarrassed themselves by a too strict adherence to the hypothesis of their fellow-countryman Webb. As it is, they have to jettison two of his supposed archetypes (γ^b and μ) to keep their ship afloat. And the hypothesis of a δ -archetype with descendants which more or less strongly influenced MSS. of the γ -class does not commend itself as an entirely convincing explanation of the so-called mixed class of MSS.

Finally there are indications that this chapter was not revised in view of the conclusions reached from the miniatures. The archetype Y (whose function is obscure) is described (p. 20) as possibly containing miniatures. But it is earlier than the fourth century, and yet the miniatures, *ex hypothesi*, do not appear till the fifth century. And it is foolish to argue (p. 17) for a possible *Ego Calliopius Feci* (or *Scripti*), written by Calliopius about 300 A.D., when one proves elsewhere that he belonged to the fifth century.⁴

But these are minor blemishes,

velut si
egregio inspersos reprehendas corpore naevos.

The *egregium corpus* is a solid contribution to the evidence for late Roman and medieval art with its evolution in different periods and environments, and to the knowledge of the history and filiation of certain MSS. of Terence. It is a worthy product of American scholarship.

J. D. CRAIG.

University of Sheffield.

² See Lindsay in *Class. Quart.* XIX (1925), 102.

⁴ I note here, simply because it occurs to me, that Rodenwaldt's evidence on the dating of the *cortinae* (which appear on the doors in C, P and F) is differently given by Jachmann (p. 14 of Preface to *Codex Vaticanus*, 'not before the fourth century') and by Jones and Morey (p. 198, not before 'the second half of the fourth century').

¹ It was Jachmann who first gave detailed proof of this in *Die Geschichte des Terenstextes im Altertum*.

³ As the authors acknowledge, though they consider his evidence inadequate. Compare L. W. Jones in *Class. Phil.* XXV, No. 4. That article, however, does not shake the principles on which the argument is based.

LUCRETIVS.

Lukrez: Seine Gestalt in seinem Gedicht. (Neue Wege zur Antike, Reihe II, Heft I.) Von OTTO REGENBOGEN. Pp. 88. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1932. Paper, R.M. 4.80.

THIS book is based upon a course of lectures, and the author has taken the opportunity to expand in print what he had already said by word of mouth. The subject is strictly limited: there is no discussion of the Epicurean system, and no guess-work about the circumstances of the poet's life. (The author says, indeed, in a note on p. 19, that he believes Lucretius not to have been a Roman or even a Latin, and not to have belonged to the highest circles of Roman society; but for this conclusion he assigns no reasons, merely saying, *Das folgt für mich aus dem Gedicht.*)

The sole object of the book is to investigate as closely as possible the mind of Lucretius. How did Lucretius the poet become Lucretius the Epicurean? How far was it possible for the two opposite characters to exist side by side in the same human breast?—these are the questions. There is also some preliminary discussion, excellent of its kind, which deals with Roman public life in the poet's time, his position in respect of earlier and contemporary Roman literature, and his relation to the Greek writers and to Epicurus in particular. But most of the book is devoted to the proems which Lucretius prefixed to each of his six books. For it is here especially that we can grasp the relation of the man to his age, his subject, and his master (p. 28). To the author the proem to the first book seems the most significant for his purpose, and it is reserved to the end. Here he maintains that vv. 44-49 of Book I, which all editors have rejected

as an interpolation, were written by Lucretius for this place but never properly *eingearbeitet*. He seems hardly aware, however, of the difficulties involved in this hypothesis.

The author seems to have read everything that has been written about Lucretius, and he refers constantly to the work that has been done in this department by English (or British) scholars. He evidently attaches special value to the criticism of W. Y. Sellar, whose work on Virgil has perhaps, with us, overshadowed his services to Lucretius. He knows English poetry too, quoting Mrs. Browning, and suggesting as a motto for a statue of Lucretius the lines in which Wordsworth described the face of Newton's statue in the chapel of Trinity College.¹ It is strange therefore that he does not mention Tennyson; years ago it was said by a good critic and competent scholar that the two best commentators on Lucretius were Munro and Tennyson.²

This is not an easy book to read. The author's vocabulary is surprisingly large, and some of his sentences spread over half a page. But the writing is always vigorous and often eloquent: it glows with an intense admiration for Lucretius and an equally intense sympathy for the tragic dilemma in which the poet was involved, torn in one direction by his genius for poetry and in another by passionate gratitude to his deliverer, Epicurus.

J. D. DUFF.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

¹ Wordsworth's lines (on p. 87) are incorrectly quoted; and on p. 48 'temporaries' is an error for 'contemporaries.' But these are quite exceptional lapses.

² Herbert Paul, *Men and Letters* (1901), p. 26.

A COMMENTARY ON THE ARS POETICA.

Horazens Epistel über die Dichtkunst erklärt. (Philologus, Supplementband XXIV, Heft 3.) Von OTTO IMMISCH. Pp. viii + 218. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1932. Paper, 12.80 (bound, 14.50) M. No close student of the *Ars Poetica*

can afford to neglect this *Erklärung*. Horace's poem contains a series of pronouncements which raise never-ending problems; it does not strike the individual scholar necessarily in the same light at each return to its

perusal; and it has struck the taste of different generations in different ways. Fresh contributions to the criticism of its literary canons are therefore to be expected; and the present commentary is made imperative by Jensen's researches into Neoptolemos and Philodemos as Horatian sources and by such resultant investigations into the theory of ancient poetic art as underlie Rostagni's editions of Aristotle's *Poetics* (1927) and Horace's *Ars Poetica* (1930). Herr Immisch, while he acknowledges their services to Horatian scholarship, has frequent occasion to contest their findings. There is, for example, a radical difference between Rostagni's view and the author's regarding the relation of Horace to his originals. The latter, aiming at studying the *Ars Poetica* in its full historical relations, past and contemporary, insists upon its Roman and specifically Horatian elements which prove that its writer used Hellenic tradition freely and without enslavement. He consequently opposes Rostagni's conception that the poet was burdened with a tralatian system of criticism which had descended from the Peripatetic-Alexandrine *trattatisti*. Certainly the general freshness of expression and the recurrence of special Roman points support the author's attitude, and tend also to justify his belief that both Kroll and Latte have overestimated Horace's Hellenistic obligations.

The interpretative analysis occupies most of the book. It is preceded by thirty-two introductory pages on (1) the date of composition, which, it is argued, was 20-19 B.C.; (2) Neoptolemos and, most particularly—because it affects the division of the poem into its three main parts—the Neoptolemic triad *ποίησις*, *ποίημα*, *ποιητής*, of which the first is here taken to denote poetic creation and the second the result of such creative activity; (3) Horace's relation to Neoptolemos and the influence upon the poet of elements of criticism de-

rivable not exclusively from early Hellenistic theory but also from thought much closer to Horace's time. He had, it will be remembered, himself studied in Athens, and, if we connect the *Ars Poetica* with the eclecticism of Antiochos, we should note the importance in Augustan Rome of Areios Didymos as an erudite representative of the eclectic school.

Having cleared the ground by his definitions in the introduction, Herr Immisch assigns as the main headings for his analysis I *περὶ ποιήσεως* (ll. 1-152), II *περὶ ποιήματος* (ll. 153-294), III *περὶ ποιητοῦ* (ll. 295-476).

Space is not available for an account of the subdivisions under these headings, or for any full illustration of the careful study devoted to the connexion of thought in what, it should always be recollected, is a *causerie*. The scrutiny of the terminology employed indicates Horace's reaction to the theoretical teaching on literature imparted by various schools down to his own day, including some doctrines which he shares with, though he may not bequeath them to, the pseudo-Longinus. Suffice it to say that much suggestive matter will be found in discussions like those on the sudden opening with the tenet of unity in art, on the purple patch, on the *pulchrum* and the *dulce*, on the implications of *imitatio* (a far-reaching question), on the very remarkable prominence given to the Satyric Drama and on its significance for the prospects of Latin literature at the time. Incidentally, the main textual *crucis* are touched upon. A valuable treatise would have been made more serviceable if a bibliography had been introduced independently of references in the letterpress, which increase the learning (but also the weight) of the German sentences.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

THE DIVINITY OF THE ROMAN EMPEROR.

The Divinity of the Roman Emperor. By LILY ROSS TAYLOR. Pp. xvi+296; 47 figures. Middletown, Connecticut: American Philological Association, 1931. Cloth.

A WORK such as this has long been needed, and scholars will have reason to be grateful to Miss Taylor for her thorough collection of the evidence connected with the establishment of ruler-cult in Italy, since the article of Herzog-Hauser in Pauly-Wissowa is, as Miss Taylor herself found (p. 58), of little value. Here is a most searching and careful collection of the literary and inscriptional evidence, with ample discussion and documentation, and the whole book is written with an intellectual honesty that is very attractive: Miss Taylor does not gloze over difficulties, and where a reader disagrees with her he will usually find that she herself has presented all the material necessary to make a case.

Chapter I. deals with ruler-cult in Persia and Egypt and the East, and Chapter II. with the divine honours often offered to Roman governors in the East and the gradual infiltration of the sentiment for deification into Italy: here it may be remarked that the shrine of Publius Servilius Isauricus and Roma at Ephesus (p. 37) was an admirable republican precedent for Augustus to follow, and that due notice is taken of such popular expressions of feeling as those towards the Gracchi, Marius, and Marius Gratidianus; on the other hand the bronze Capitoline Wolf can hardly be used as evidence for the existence of the Romulus-legend 'perhaps as early as the end of the regal period' (p. 43), and the impersonation of Jupiter by the *triumphator* is not really certain (p. 45). There follow three very interesting (and highly debatable) chapters on the period between 50 and 30 B.C. in which Miss Taylor seeks to demonstrate that Julius Caesar tried to found a Divine Monarchy and received divine honours in his lifetime, and then gives a sketch of the tendency to deification down to Antony's death. The last five chapters recount the formation of the state-cult of Augustus and its gradual

spread and development; there are three appendices, including a very useful list of inscriptions recording divine honours paid to Julius Caesar, Antony, and Augustus.

To review this book adequately would require more space than is allowed. The later chapters rest on the sure ground of epigraphical and archaeological finds as well as the comparatively accurate *Res Gestae* and Suetonius' *Life of Augustus*. Here there is much to praise: the origin and the development of the cult are set out with great clarity and full notice of the recent archaeological evidence; I could wish Miss Taylor had carried her book down to Nero's time and hope that in the future she will do so. The earlier chapters are more doubtful and controversial, and here I would make two observations: (i) Miss Taylor might have made some attempt to express what this deification-feeling really meant, and (ii) she is a little uncritical in her use of sources. To develop these remarks further: (i) On such questions as deification it is possible to state 'the facts' and yet give a misleading impression. Nothing is so difficult to interpret as human feeling towards religion, nothing should be treated with greater care; when Frederick the Great, desecrating on the topic of the dead Voltaire to d'Alembert, proclaimed 'je lui fais tous les matins ma prière; je lui dis, *Divin Voltaire, ora pro nobis*,' he would be a bold man who claimed to understand exactly Frederick's feelings. Deification of rulers was obviously common and frequent in the ancient world, but did subjects really look on their rulers as they looked on their gods? Did they really expect present help from them in trouble? Was deification more than a sign of lively gratitude and homage? 'οὐδεὶς εὐεργέτην βoῦν ἔθυσεν ἀλλ' ἢ Πυρρίας' ran the proverb, and we may wonder whether the average Hellenised provincial ever made vows for deliverance from peril to his many *Saviours* and *Benefactors*, or really looked on them in the same way as the older gods. It is a difficult question certainly, but I wish Miss Taylor had discussed

it, for it is immensely important, it lies at the root of the whole subject of ruler-cult, and she is well qualified to deal with it.

(ii) I feel that Miss Taylor is rather apt at times to treat contemporary and non-contemporary sources as all alike and to quote Cicero and Dio Cassius as though they were of equal value; when she says (p. 96, n. 36) 'Dio's account . . . is the best source for the deification of Caesar' the reader must pause and wonder whether the lateness and known bias of Dio do not tend to discredit much of what he says. When Dio asserts that a bronze statue of Caesar was set up bearing the inscription *ὅτι ἡμίθεός ἐστι* (XLIII. 21, 2), we may wonder whether he has not confused this with the statue that Octavian set up later (Pliny, *N.H.* II. 94 and Servius *Dan. ad Verg. Ecl.* ix. 47);¹ when he asserts that the Senate decreed that Caesar's son and heir should be *Pontifex Maximus* (XLIV. 5, 3), a decree nowhere else reported and not referred to even in the *Res Gestae*, we must take leave to doubt; when he asserts (XLVII. 31, 5) that Cleopatra addressed her son as 'Caesarion'—a nickname bestowed on the boy by mocking Alexandria—we may take leave to doubt again. And such mistakes of Dio are typical and common, and naturally enough tend to invalidate credence in his unsupported statements; this is why when he says (XLIII. 45, 3) that a statue of Caesar was set in the temple of Quirinus with the epigraph *θεῷ ἀνικτήτῳ* we can fairly assume that this was not equivalent to making Caesar a god but could simply mean that he was placed under the protection of Quirinus, as was often done.²

Sometimes too I think Miss Taylor is over-ready to accept stories and rumours of low evidential value, as e.g. the Scipio Africanus saga (p. 55), the rumour that Caesar thought of shifting the capital from Italy to the East (pp. 75 f.)—where the very mention of Ilium (by the side of Alexandria) is sufficient to show that the whole project was part of anti-

Caesarian ridicule and propaganda—and the absurd tale that Octavian once appeared at a banquet of the Twelve Gods garbed as Apollo. 'And is it likely,' as Professor Nock remarked to me when discussing the incident, 'that Octavian would have allowed anyone to play Jupiter to his Apollo?' Indeed in Chapter V. she sometimes regards as evidence statements which are obviously nothing more than fragments of the propaganda-warfare that was waged so lustily by Antony and Octavian and their adherents, with which much of Dio Cassius and parts of Suetonius' *Life of Augustus* are full.

In the chapters on Augustus there is much that is admirable, and the only real objection I would urge is that Miss Taylor seems to treat Augustus' attitude as one merely of prudent statecraft, and does not emphasise sufficiently the belief which he cherished not only in the importance and efficacy of the state-religion but also in himself as the restorer of it: the different priesthoods that he held, the rebuilding of the temples, the celebration in 29 B.C. of the *Augurium Salutis*, and the holding in 17 B.C. of the Secular Games were outward and visible signs of an inward and invisible thing, a deep religious consciousness, wherein he differed greatly from his adoptive father Julius Caesar. And his position as *Pontifex Maximus*, as Warde Fowler pointed out, was 'a position absolutely incompatible with godhead,' godhead that he would not have. At the end of the book the appendix, No. 3, is most useful and comprehensive, though in arguing for an early dating for the establishment of the imperial cult in Gallia Narbonensis, as against Krascheninnikov (p. 281), Miss Taylor—who plays the game of controversy with a scrupulousness and honesty that are exemplary—comes perilously near special pleading.

To sum up: though I cannot regard the authoress as having proved her thesis about Julius Caesar, the remaining chapters are convincing in their general import. I hope that such remarks and criticisms as have been made above will not be taken as depreciatory in any way, for the book is of high value, and indeed one of its

¹ That the title *ἡμίθεος* was inscribed in Greek (p. 65) seems to me extremely improbable.

² See e.g. A. D. Nock, *Σύνναος Θεός*, in *Harvard Stud. in Class. Phil.*, XLI, 1930, p. 3 and n. 2.

chief merits is that it provokes argument and discussion on a topic of great importance. Such misprints as are to be found on pages 9, 40, 56, 86, 128 and 143 are quite harmless and can easily be corrected: the book is clear, well printed and well illustrated. The American Philological Association is to be congratulated upon so excellent an inauguration of its new series of monographs, and I trust that Miss Taylor

will continue her work and carry it down to the death of Nero, for that marks a definite stop:¹ with the Flavians something quite different arrived.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

St. John's College, Cambridge.

¹ Take e.g. the excellent article by J. Gagé on *Divus Augustus* in *Revue Archéologique*, 1931, pp. 11 ff.

OLD ITALY IN VERGIL.

Das geographische Bild des alten Italien in Vergils Aeneis. Von BERNHARD REHM. Pp. 112. (*Philologus*, Supplementband XXIV., Heft II.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1932. Paper, RM. 7 (bound, 8.50).

AN interesting and suggestive book. Herr Rehm is thoroughly conversant with the literature of his subject and up to date in it. As he does not, like some of his fellow-countrymen, neglect English authorities, he makes good use of Warde Fowler's well-known books, of Miss Crump's valuable *Growth of the Aeneid*, and of Dr. Mackail's recent edition. The author's main sources are, as might be expected, the catalogues of books 7 and 10 (North Italy) and the short periplus of book 3. A propos of the disputed 3. 702 he very plausibly suggests (pp. 38, 39) that a line with the meaning 'where lies the city of Gela, founded by the Cretans and Lindians' has dropped out between 701 and 702, and that Gela is to be taken as the genitive of Gelas (the river).

Attractive, too, is the theory that Vergil's epithet for Selinus, *palmosa*, is

due to a mistake on the part of the poet. Vergil, it is suggested, knew no more of Selinus than its coins and mistook the sprig of parsley on these for a palm-leaf.

The latter half of the book deals with the topography of the Rome-Ostia-Lavinium triangle, the scene of books 7-12. Herr Rehm disagrees with Carcopino's equation of Laurentum with Lavinium, and regards the scenic descriptions as in the main of the literary-conventional type; an exception being made of the Tiber, with which, as he holds, Vergil deals more realistically. The author points out that in general Vergil's pictures of scenery are few and that he contents himself rather, following the example of Homer in the catalogue of B, with the use of pictorial epithets.

The book ends with an examination of Vergil's catalogues as compared with that of Silius Italicus in book 8. For all three Herr Rehm sees a common source in Varro, *Antiq. humanae*, book xi.

M. PLATNAUER.

Brasenose College, Oxford.

VERGIL IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Vergil in the Experience of South Africa.

By T. J. HAARHOFF, B.A., B.Litt., Litt.D. Pp. xii + 127. Oxford: Blackwell, 1931. Cloth, 6s.

THAT this delightful book is the twelfth¹ of Messrs. Blackwell's series of Vergilian studies which have already given

¹ Excluding two or three which the publisher adds to the list, but which, though they deal with Vergil, do so in the established forms of translation, commentary or biography.

great pleasure to every lover of the poet is a welcome sign of our times. Professor Haarhoff is not concerned, as his title might suggest, with dusty details of curricula and examinations. He goes to the heart of his subject by showing with fascinating precision how the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* touch the life of South Africa.

² A simple Boer farmer read an Afrikaans translation of the *Georgics*. He sat up all

night, . . . and learned, with a surprised fellow-feeling, how the Roman farmer ploughed with oxen, as he himself did . . . ; saw him irrigating sun-scorched fields, as in South Africa, by leading water in furrows, . . . ; heard how he burned the stubble in his cornfields for purposes of fertilising, just as he himself burned his veld.'

'On hearing Vergil's advice (*G.* 1. 290) that stubble should be cut at night, and an unlikely explanation, the old man suggested that, as the left hand that grasped the hard and brittle stalks very soon became hot and sore, the point of Vergil's advice was that the moisture might serve as an alleviation. Of great interest to him was the famous passage in which Vergil says that when the "kings" of the bees fight, they may be brought to rest by scattering a little dust . . . ; for that was exactly what the coloured servants on his farm were in the habit of doing.'

The likenesses between the outlook of Cato the Censor and the Dutch farmer lead to a thoughtful comparison between the Stoic and the Calvinist creed; followed by a no less thoughtful examination of the Augustan reconstruction, the part which Vergil played in it and beyond it, and of the relation of both to the problems of the British Empire. The book shows the fruit of close study, as when we learn that the words for 'master' and 'slave' and 'slavery' appear nowhere in the *Georgics*, and in the *Aeneid* only in one case within the actual story: whereas the old word *famulus*, which carries a certain affectionate colour of familiarity, is used thirteen times. On the greater

themes of the *Aeneid* we may note a typical comment:

'Behind the dazzling splendour . . . , Vergil sees the suffering that is inherent in all empire-building. . . .'

'Vergil pictures the cost of Aeneas' success in following the commands of fate. Dido's life is destroyed; his own is deprived of all spontaneous joy. . . . He completes his task, a task that he dare not and cannot shirk; but behind it is infinite suffering. And that is what Vergil feels about Carthage.'

It is interesting to find further that the name 'holism', which General Smuts recently¹ defended with such eloquence before the British Association, is claimed by Professor Haarhoff as the best title for Vergil's view of the Universe.

'Vergil sees the World-Spirit, not merely as the source of life in the physical sense, but as Mind, as God, as the ultimate essence of living. . . . It may be wondered whether . . . he would in time have gone a step further, and interpreted the World-Spirit in terms of love; . . . the attitude that reaches out continually in an effort to understand and sympathise and unite. . . . It is when we see things as he does, *sub specie aeternitatis* as well as *sub specie humanitatis*, that we experience the power that reconciles and makes one. . . . That is a whole-making tendency.'

'Vergil . . . is the most significant figure of the Roman world; and he was chosen as a guide by Dante, the most significant figure of the Middle Ages. It is part of the . . . universality of his spirit, that he should have a meaning for us, too.'

R. S. CONWAY.

St. Albans.

¹ This notice was written in January.

ANCIENT COMMENTARIES ON VIRGIL.

Esegesi Virgiliana Antica. Prolegomeni alla edizione del Commento di Giunio Filargirio e di Tito Gallo. By G. FUNAIOLI. Pp. 509. Milan: Società editrice 'Vita e Pensiero,' 1930. Paper, L.35.

THIS volume gathers together six articles published separately in learned periodicals and containing the preliminary spade-work necessary to the editing of the body of Virgil scholia associated chiefly with the name of 'Philargirius,'¹ the author's purpose

being to offer his new edition as a contribution to the Bimillenary of Virgil.

The reviewer pleads guilty to having delayed the present notice an unconscionable time.

The inadequacy of Hagen's recension of *Iunii Philargirii Explanatio* and of the *Brevis Expositio* in his *Appendix Serviana* (Vol. III ii of Thilo's *Servii Grammatici Commentarii*) was demonstrated, and the plan of a better sketched, by Barwick. Funaioli set himself to work out the whole problem in detail. Hagen had not observed that the *Scholia Bernensia* contained a version (b) of the original body of scholia (ω) quite independent of the version (a) of the *Explanatio* and the *Expo-*

¹ I give the commentator's name in a familiar form. It is variously corrupted in the MSS. Heraeus, in *Rhein. Mus.* LXXIX, p. 391, infers that the original form was probably *Filargirius*.

sitio. The comparison of *a* and *b* throws light on their common source.

Now each of these versions presents two different epitomes, a longer and a shorter, of the same original material, pointing ultimately to compilation from marginal notes in texts of Virgil. The result is a veritable *selva selvaggia* of comments that are interrupted, or truncated, or repeated, or dislocated from their appropriate lemmas. Let it be added that the original compilation contained the work of 'Philargirius' and Gallus and Gaudentius (the two latter still quite shadowy figures), with elements of Servian origin, and that late accretions swell the number of scholia in our MSS. The primary task is to reconstruct the comments in an intelligible form and, when that is done, as far as possible to allot them to their respective authors. Only those who have had to do with ancient Commentaries in their medieval ruins can appreciate its complexity. To this task Funaioli has brought the greatest knowledge, skill and thoroughness. The value of the record of his critical labours does not end with the constitu-

tion of the text to which they are a preliminary. An exposure of the formulas and the methods of excerptors cannot fail to have a wider application. For instance, a somewhat similar problem still awaits solution in our Commentary of Donatus on Terence. The success of Funaioli is a foretaste of what may yet be accomplished for Donatus.

The original compilation of these Virgil scholia is traced to Ireland, possibly to a certain Adamnanus (mentioned at *Ecl.* III, 90 in *Expl.* I a), but whether he is the same as Columba's biographer, abbot of Iona 679-704 A.D., is more than doubtful.

Other aspects of the subject deserve fuller treatment than can be allowed to them in a short review, e.g. the nature and the value of 'Philargirius' contribution to knowledge of Virgil (Chapter 6).

The volume ends with three Appendices: (1) *Scholia Vaticana Reginensia ad Vergilium*, (2) on Julian of Toledo, (3) on the Valenciennes Codex 394.

J. D. CRAIG.

University of Sheffield.

THE ORDER OF CLAUSES IN LATIN.

Stilistische Studien zur Erweiterung der Satzglieder im Lateinischen. Von ELMO LINDHOLM. Pp. 225. Lund: Gleerup, 1931. Paper.

WHEN two or more words or groups of words are connected in a sentence the order in which they occur is determined by various reasons. Sometimes the more important idea comes first, sometimes that which is first in place or time. The words may also be arranged in such an order as will produce a desired rhythm; and finally there is some ground for the theory that in many languages words with a high-pitched vowel tend to precede those with a vowel of lower pitch, e.g. 'ding-dong,' 'tick-tack.' When two synonymous words are connected it has been shown that there is a prevailing tendency to place the longer term second, so as by its duration, as it were, to counterbalance the emphasis necessarily given to the prior member by its posi-

tion. Again, where the two words are of the same length some addition is very often made either by inserting an adjective or adverb or in some other way increasing the duration of the second member, so that in word-groups or sentences composed of two or more members the order is governed except for special reasons by what has been called 'the law of increasing members.' In the present study of the form of the Latin sentence Lindholm has traced the working of this law of composition through the entire language with a minute analysis of all authors and kinds of writing from the legal phraseology of the earliest laws down to Minucius Felix. His analysis shows clearly how the fullness and seeming redundancy of the language of early Roman law and religion develop through the painstaking minuteness of Cato's agricultural instructions and the comic exaggerations of Plautus to the swelling

periods of Cicero and Livy, and even to the pointed brevity of Tacitus and the Silver Latin writers. One is apt to forget that in Tacitus, so renowned for his pregnant brevity, the sentence *εὐρήσει τὰ σαθρὰ τῶν ἐκείνου πραγμάτων αὐτὸς ὁ πόλεμος* (Demosth. *Phil.* 4, 44) appears as 'aperiet et recludet connecta et tumescentia partium volnera bellum ipsum' (*Hist.* 2. 77). It is impossible to do justice in short space to the fine scholarship and wide knowledge that have gone to the making of this interesting work. One may merely state that there is in it an excellent examination from this point of view of

the styles of Plautus, Sallust, Cicero, to mention only the best, in which they are compared with their Greek counterparts, and also a very interesting and suggestive analysis of the Trochaic Septenarius and the Dactylic Hexameter in which the caesurae divide the line on the principle of 'increasing members.' Lindholm also applies with much effect the results of his examination of style as an aid in textual criticism. The work is fully documented and has a useful index, and the printing is clear and good.

P. S. NOBLE.

University of Leeds.

THE HARROWING OF HELL.

Gott und Hölle: der Mythos vom Descensuskampfe (*Studien der Bibliothek Warburg*, XX.). By JOSEF KROLL. Pp. vii+569. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1932. Paper, Rm. 25.

THIS is an interesting and learned work, written to explain a phenomenon which rightly struck the author as curious, namely the resemblance between Christian descriptions of the Harrowing of Hell (for example that in the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus) and those passages of Senecan tragedy which deal with Herakles' descent to fetch up Kerberos. After putting forth a shorter study, *Beiträge zum Descensus ad Inferos*, in the form of lectures, he has printed the present book, which goes into the matter thoroughly from all sides, lacking only first-hand knowledge of the Oriental material and, though this is not of much importance, full treatment of the mediaeval developments; the English mystery-plays, for instance, are hardly touched upon. The general conclusion, which is at least highly plausible, is as follows. The original form of the story is probably Babylonian, the descent of Ishtar. When Persian dualism was superimposed upon the native Sumero-Babylonian thought, the underworld became a place definitely evil and hostile to the celestial gods, who therefore would of necessity go there as enemies, forcing their way in and imposing their will on the inhabitants. So grandiose a con-

ception as this found expression in certain literary forms, of which traces are to be found, for instance, in Hebrew literature and elsewhere among peoples whose theological thought does not tend to dualism. Notably, they found their way to the Greeks, and thence to the Romans; not, however, in the classical epoch of Greece, for Herakles' adventure, perhaps originally a true Harrowing, is, so far as we know, simply a marvellous exploit, leading to nothing further, until well after Alexander. Seneca, however, connects it definitely with Herakles' apotheosis, and this can hardly be due to any knowledge or perception of the original meaning of the Greek tale. It is likely that the literary expression of the idea and something of the dualistic idea itself made its way westward via magical formulae and perhaps also in the mystery-cults.

As regards the non-classical material, where the author modestly admits that his learning is second-hand, and is careful to cite his sources fully (where Mandaeism is in question he follows Reitzenstein and Lidzbarski, but with moderation and some independence of judgment), the reviewer is not competent to criticise. On classical ground, most of his analysis is very plausible and probably right; it may be worth while to indicate one or two slight defects of details. On p. 491, handling the witch-scene in Lucan (VI, 744), he

seems to think that Erichtho threatens, like Statius' Teiresias and numerous necromancers, to invoke the supreme celestial deity to compel the *inferi* to do her bidding. Lucan himself, however, shows that he means an infernal god, probably, for no classical figure suits his description, Ahriman:

indespecta tenet uobis qui Tartara, cuius
uos estis superi, Stygias qui peierat undas;

in fact an anti-Zeus. On p. 493, it would be interesting to know how he trans-

lates *ordo* in Statius, *Theb.* IV, 529; his paraphrase of the passage suggests a misunderstanding. Once, in discussing a Christian writing (p. 32), he makes a curious slip; when Satan, in the *Acta Thomae*, p. 149, says *συγγενής εἰμι ἐκείνου τοῦ μέλλοντος ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς ἔρχεσθαι*, he refers of course not to the Second Coming, but to Antichrist.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

The Acropolis photographica by WALTER HEGE, described by GERHART RODENWALDT (translated by PHYLLIS HARTNOLL, assisted by ELIZABETH E. BOUMAN). Pp. 63, with 35 illustrations and a plan, followed by 104 plates. Oxford: Blackwell. Cloth, 37s. 6d.

THE text of this attractive book is excellent and the photographs very beautiful. It is a pity that Hege's interesting account of the immense care spent on their production is printed on the dust-cover and almost impossible to preserve. The work, printed in Germany, has, unfortunately, many misprints (for example, 'peripheral' and 'monophtheron' for 'peripteral' and 'monopteron', 'Mycaenian' for 'Myceanean', 'Catalian' for 'Catalan', 'the battle of the Erymedon'), and the translation has not been revised by an expert. Thus we find 'Aegean' for 'Aeginetan' (p. 7), 'facets' for 'regulae' (pp. 16, 41, etc.), 'axe' for 'axis' (p. 33), 'in antae' for 'in antis' (p. 47), 'Amphitheatre' for 'cavea' (p. 20).

Rodenwaldt is perhaps too emphatic in his insistence on the Greek lack of feeling for picturesque unity, but his treatment of the various buildings is original and interesting. The statement on p. 24 that the Parthenon was blown up in 1698 is presumably a misprint.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung. Interpretationen und Untersuchungen. Von LEONHARD ILLIG. Pp. 108. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1932. Paper, RM. 4.50.

THE main purpose of this careful and excellent dissertation, which owes much to Schadewaldt, is to prove that Pindar was far more careful of unity and relevance than recent critics have tended to allow, and that the key to many apparent difficulties in his narrative methods is his profoundly *paradeigmatic* use of mythical history. After a general introduction Illig discusses at some length the myths of *Nem.* i, *Ol.* xiii, *Pyth.* ix, and *Pyth.* iii, which he regards as especially typical. In the third and fourth sections he treats in a general way of concentric composition in Pindar, and of the increasing preponderance of the gnomic over the narrative element, culminating in the late

Eighth Nemean. He then discusses *Pyth.* iv, x, xii, and xi, and endeavours to solve certain special difficulties in these odes by means of the general principles which he has established. He closes with a useful summary of his results, and with two good indices. The dissertation is packed with detail, and many of the conclusions are disputable; but the only important error of fact that I have noticed is on p. 78, where he says of *Nem.* v 'Die Aiakiden . . . sind hier zu drei Endais-Söhnen differenziert (10). Aus ihrer Gesamtheit wird der eine besonders hervorgehoben ('*Ἐνδαιῶδες ἀργυρότερος υἱὸς καὶ βία Φόκου κρόοντος*'). Illig has forgotten that the next words inform us that Phocus was not a son of Endais but of Psamathea. There are several misprints: two might perhaps mislead, 'Jason' for 'Iasion' (p. 44, n. 2) and 'Eumeniden' for 'Emmeniden' (p. 79, n. 2). Two especially good passages may be mentioned: the contrast between *Nem.* i and Theocritus xxv (p. 24), and the brilliant rewriting (p. 60), in Pindar's manner, of Bacchylides's handling in x of the myth of Proetus's daughters.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Index Aristophaneus ab O. J. TODD confectus. Pp. ix + 275. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, 28s.

PROFESSOR TODD, of the University of British Columbia, had the use of materials collected under the auspices of John Williams White, but I gather that very much work remained for him to do. It was a noble task.

His base is the Oxford text, from which he departs at a hundred points or so, mostly small matters of spelling and accentuation; they are duly recorded in a useful list.

The symbols are well chosen and clearly explained; and a specimen is given of the arrangement of the parts of a verb, and of its compounds, under the main lemma. I could wish that he had given each compound a lemma of its own, if only in the form 'ἐπιτρέπω v. τρέπω'; but where so much is well done it would be churlish to ask for more.

No meanings are assigned except such as are necessary for distinction (see *χρᾶω*). The book is an Index, not a Lexicon.

Since it came to me I have used it much, especially over some common words, for I was busy with certain comparisons of tragic and comic use. That is a good test, and I have found just three mistakes: ἀξίονος for ἀξύνου, V for N under ἐθήμερε, and 233 for 333 under τοιοῦτος *sub fin.*

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Plato und der Heraklitismus: ein Beitrag zum Problem der Historie im platonischen Dialog (Philologus, Supplementband XXIII, Heft 1). Von EMIL WEERTS. Pp. 84. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1931. Paper, M. 5.50 (bound, 7).

THIS monograph is of greater value than is suggested by the opening chapters, which contain a rather confused discussion of the problem of the relation between Plato and the Heracliteans, and lead to the negative conclusion that Aristotle's accounts of the matter in the *Metaphysics*, whether dependable or not, are not merely inferences from the *Cratylus* and the *Theaetetus*. Weerts rightly maintains that the evidence of these two dialogues (which he, like Warburg, places close together in date of composition) can be estimated only after a general study of Plato's method as a historian; and this brings him to the most interesting and important part of his work—an account of the 'historical dialectic' of the later dialogues as a development of the 'Socratic dialectic' of the earlier, with the *Theaetetus* as an illustration. He concludes that attempts such as Warburg has made at Quellenforschung in the *Cratylus* and *Theaetetus* are unlikely to bear much fruit.

As the author himself indicates in the Preface, all this offers no positive or definite result; but it suggests a valuable line of approach to the historical problems of the later dialogues, and gives a much-needed warning against misuse of their evidence. In a work which is mainly theoretical and rests on little more than occasional quotations from Plato and Aristotle there cannot be much question of accurate scholarship, but one may perhaps note that Weerts assumes without comment the genuineness of the third fragment of Philolaus and *Alcibiades I*, and asserts that the reference to the Heracliteans at *Theaetetus* 179d 'gibt nur einen negativen Anhalt,' whereas they are actually described as enthusiastic supporters of ἡ φαινόμενη οὐσία.

H. C. BALDREY.

Trinity Hall, Cambridge.

Neue Untersuchungen zu platonischen Dialogen.

Von H. RICK. Pp. viii + 391. Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1931. Paper, M. 20.

THIS is a most peculiar book. The author starts with the quite sensible suggestion that Plato had contemporary controversies in mind in writing his dialogues. But it appears to him to follow from this, without more ado, that almost all the dialogues are directed against Antisthenes. In the development of this thesis he out-Dümmers Dümmler and out-Jöels Jöel, and Antisthenes appears as the original behind

Polus in the *Gorgias*, Thrasyarchus in the *Republic*, Protagoras in the *Protagoras*, Meno, Anytus and Meno's slave in the *Meno*, Euthydemus and Dionysodorus, Cratylus (of course), Euthyphro, Lysis, Simmias and Cebes, and even, apparently, Diotima. One method of arriving at these results is as follows. If any remark of a particular character has the slightest resemblance to a remark attributed on any authority to Antisthenes, that is sufficient to identify that character with him. Consequently if any remark by that character resembles any remark by another character in another dialogue, then this second character can equally be identified with Antisthenes. The arguments have not, however, always even this degree of coherence. But I forbear to give further illustrations, as no one who has not read the original could possibly regard them as anything but caricatures.

G. C. FIELD.

University of Bristol.

Die Thesis. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Entstehung und Geschichte. Von H. THROM. Pp. 198. (Rhetorische Studien, 17. Heft.) Paderborn: Schöningh, 1932. Paper, M. 11.

THIS is a valuable contribution to rhetorical studies, based on a thorough examination and careful weighing of the evidence. While largely concerned with minutiae of classification, it has also a more general bearing on the relation between rhetoric and philosophy in ancient thought. Dr. Throm starts out from the question, how far is the so-called *Diatribē* identical with the *Thesis*, and comes to the conclusion that, so far as concerns the nature of the problem and the method of its investigation, the *Diatribē* is no more than a particular kind of *Thesis*, παρατηρητική or πρακτική. In Part I he defines the subject-matter and aim of Rhetoric and Dialectic. In Part II he discusses the importation of the dialectical *Thesis* into Rhetoric. Hermagoras, by including *Thesis* as well as *Hypothesis* in the domain of rhetoric, made rhetoric into a science, and so annoyed the philosophers. Cicero, possessed by the ideal of the philosophical orator, took the further step of identifying *Thesis* and *Hypothesis*, holding that all particular questions are at bottom universal. (Dr. Throm controverts the view that Hermagoras had already identified *Thesis* with τὸ κρυπόμενον, and thus anticipated Cicero.) Part III gives a history of the *Thesis* from Protagoras onwards.

In certain cases Throm argues against current interpretations. He maintains that, in Hermagoras' πολιτικὸν ζήτημα, πολιτικόν means 'connected with public life,' not 'understood of the people'; and that in Arist. *Rhet.* 1354a 1 f. πάντων is neuter, 'das für die Erkenntnis gewissermassen allen Dingen gemeinsam ist' (linguistically rather difficult, perhaps).

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College, Oxford.

Dictionnaire de la Mythologie et des Antiquités grecques et romaines. Par PIERRE LAVEDAN. Pp. ii+1037; 1015 plates, figs. and maps. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1931.

IN the Foreword to this Dictionary it is explained that the author's original intention was to make an abridgement of Saglio's *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, but that as he worked on it a different and more independent conception took the place of the first; the modifications introduced had in view the progress of recent years in the knowledge of classical antiquity and the changed demands of higher education and popular interest. The book is designed to meet the needs, not of the specialist, but of teachers and pupils in universities and the higher forms in schools and of the general reader interested in the Greek and Roman civilisations. The articles are scholarly, lucid and of adequate length; the copious illustrations, including good plans and maps, have been brought up to date and serve their purpose of making the text clear. The use of asterisks in the course of an article to indicate the subjects on which separate articles are to be found is of great help in cross-reference.

Like so many books disclaiming interest for the specialist, this could with comparatively slight additions have been made of much greater use to the serious student by more reference to ancient sources—at least the more important, as is done here in the article on commerce, for instance—and by more indication of books to be consulted for bibliographies. Such additions would not have inconvenienced the general reader. It is for his benefit, apparently, that the scope of the work was enlarged to include mythology, but it is questionable whether the excellent and well-distributed articles on antiquities mix happily with the perfunctory notes on a few figures of classical mythology, selected on no obvious principle. If Alcestis and Agamemnon are to be included, then why not Nestor and Priam? And the general reader who wishes to track down the less familiar classical allusions he meets with in modern literature will look in vain here for Merope, or Laodameia, or Aganippe.

Since the book is intended in the first place for French readers, we ought not to cavil at the author's decision to list his articles under French nomenclature, even though other readers may less readily find the references they want. Perhaps more help might have been given through cross-references by the addition of a few headings such as 'Libertus: voir Affranchi.' For this book is certainly to be recommended to English readers as one of the best of its scope, carrying on the admirable traditions of French scholarship in this branch of classical studies.

A. M. DALE.

Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

Aulos und Kithara in der griechischen Musik bis zum Ausgang der klassischen Zeit. Von HELMUT HUCHZERMAYER. Pp. 76. Emsdetten (Westf.): H. und J. Lechte, 1931. Paper.

DR. HUCHZERMAYER'S dissertation is a convenient collection of information, which includes

recent archaeological evidence. He is concerned not with the construction of the ancient instruments or the scales that could be played upon them but with their origins and employment. Part I is mainly taken up with a convincing argument for the antiquity of the aulos in Greece. That it is only once mentioned in connexion with Greeks by Homer is the result of deliberate silence about a primitive, harsh, and therefore undignified instrument; rather than refer to it he omits all mention of an accompanying instrument where that would naturally be the aulos. It was not a new instrument but an improved type of an old one that was introduced from Asia about 700 B.C. along with the worship of Dionysus. The incidental argument that the terms *κρούμα*, *κρούσις* of instrumental music derive from the use of percussion instruments is less convincing in view of the nature of these and their specialised use in orgiastic cults. Part II examines local and temporal variations in the popularity of the different instruments. Dr. Huchzermayer gives a consistent account, though one could often wish that the evidence was less exiguous. The intense rivalry of aulos and cithara and the symbolical stories of Athena and Apollo-Marsyas are ascribed to the Athens of the fifth century with strong probability.

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Die Ueberlieferung der Scholien zu Apollonios von Rhodos. Von CARL WENDEL. Pp. 124. (*Abh. d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl.*, 3. Folge, Nr. 1.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1932. Paper, RM. 8.

DR. WENDEL traces the history of the scholia through the early commentators to a fifth-century compilation, known to the Middle Ages only in an abbreviated form from a single MS. From a fusion of this, in the time of Photius, with a full text without scholia he deduces a MS. with three direct lines of descent:

I. L, from which derive independently the MSS. of the Ambrosian recension and the scholia of the Como and London MSS. (cf. Paris, 2,846).

II. The lost parent of G and S (= L. 32: 16) with scholia severely curtailed.

III. A MS. from Crete, the source of the Paris scholia. These derive in the first place from a text with full scholia, and in the second from (a) a text with select scholia and (b) a full edition of the scholia without text.

These conclusions are reached by an argument methodically developed and fully documented; the treatise is a definite contribution to an obscure and difficult subject.

M. M. GILLIES.

University College of Hull.

Zwei religiös-politische Begriffe: Euergetes-Concordia. Von EILIR SKARD. Pp. 106. (Avhandlingar utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo.) Oslo: Dybwad, 1932. Paper, Kr. 5.

THIS is a good and useful little book of the right type, by a pupil of Professor Eitrem. Its

object is to examine two definite ideas, which are related to each other by their connection with the Greek *δύναμις*. The first part seeks to elucidate what lies behind the *βασιλεὺς εὐεργέτης*. It starts with the connection between *εὐεργέτης* and *πρόξενος*, and rightly decides that this conception of the *εὐεργέτης*, someone who had done good to the city, could not alone lead up to the Benefactor King. We then come to the *εὐεργέτης* as hero, allied to the Soter notion, the great exemplar being Heracles; this, by way of Xenophon's Cyrus, leads up to Isocrates' view that the true king must be the benefactor of mankind like Heracles (he meant Greek mankind) and must give *δύναμις* to the cities; and Isocrates' application of his idea to Philip opens the way to the Hellenistic conception of the Benefactor King. The part played by Isocrates in the matter is well brought out; he has of late years steadily grown in importance as the precursor of the future, and we have here a fresh development of that theme. The second part is primarily concerned with Rome. Romans borrowed the idea of *concordia* from Greece at the beginning of the second century B.C., but (prior to the Principate) they did not develop it as the Greeks did; it was apt to become a party cry, and at best to mean the agreement of the different orders at Rome, in face of an enemy—something to be conjoined with bravery. The most interesting point perhaps is that even at Rome *concordia* became connected with monarchy through Numa, and Augustus therefore had ready to his hand a Roman as well as a Greek line of thought. The author has naturally been unable to treat *concordia* without some consideration of *δύναμις* also, and here perhaps he hardly distinguishes sufficiently between the Stoic conception of the term and the conception which remained linked with kingship; but of course his treatment of the Greek concept is only by the way and not part of his purpose. I hope that he will follow up his present book by a study of *δύναμις* in the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial periods.

W. W. TARN.

Die semitischen Menschnamen in griechischen Inschriften und Papyri des vorderen Orients.
Von HEINZ WUTHNOW. Pp. 175. Leipzig:
Dieterich, 1930. Paper, M. 15.50.

So far as can be gathered from his rather cryptic preface, Dr. Wuthnow has excerpted the Semitic personal names from Preisigke's *Namenbuch*, and has listed them along with Semitic names contained in collections of Greek and Latin inscriptions from Syria and the provinces further south, adding the Semitic stem in each case. The utility of such a list will be obvious to all who have used e.g. Sundwall's *Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier*, and Dr. Wuthnow's compilation appears to be businesslike and sensible. Along with obviously Semitic names he includes Greek and Roman names which occur as alternatives to Semitic—as e.g. Paul was called Πάυλος ὁ καὶ Σαῦλος—or which were adopted in the Levant because their form suggested a meaning in Hebrew or Aramaic. This is all to the good;

but an acquaintance with the nomenclature of neighbouring countries would have put the author on the look-out for immigrants: thus Εἰμην, provided with a Hebrew etymology on p. 45, was a Pisidian to his finger-tips, and the Phrygians Ἀμῖας on p. 19, Μανῖς on p. 71, and Σαγῆριος on p. 100 look awkward in their Hebrew garb. It is, however, a merit in such a list to be as complete as possible, even at the risk of including matter which will promptly be restored where it belongs.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

Varro und die hellenistische Sprachtheorie
(Problemata, Heft 5). Von HELLFRIED DAHLMANN. Pp. 85. Berlin: Weidmann, 1932. Paper, RM. 6.

DR. DAHLMANN begins his work, a *Habilitationschrift* of the University of Kiel, with an account of the etymological theory of the Stoics who, unlike Plato and Aristotle, for whom the name was only a *σημείον*, made the name a guide to the definition of the thing. Varro's etymology is that of the grammarian, not that of the philosopher; but Dr. Dahlmann detects both in his method and in his matter evidence of Stoic influence. In Book V he finds in the division of the universe a translation from Chrysippus, in which Greek etymologies are replaced by corresponding Latin ones: in the later part of the book, though the material is Latin, the arrangement follows the Stoic *Kosmosanteilung*. Again, in Book VI Varro's own enquiries into Latin language and custom are combined with Stoic elements; the distinction between *loqui* and *fari* represents that between the λόγος ἐνδιδακτός and the λ. προφορικός, and various etymologies are based on Greek. Book VII is concerned with the interpretation of poetical words, and Varro's matter here comes from native sources, but in the arrangement of it he follows a Stoic division which is quite unfitted to it, and is sometimes tacitly abandoned for more rational arrangements.

Dr. Dahlmann rightly rejects Reitzenstein's view that Varro did little more than copy out the work of Aelius Stilo: but there is nothing to support his further suggestion that it was Stilo who translated into Latin the Stoic Etymologicon which Varro combined with his own antiquarian lore. And much of the evidence he adduces for Stoic origin is far from convincing. It is neither necessary nor natural to suppose that when Varro proposed the etymology *hiems quod tum multi imbres* he was translating a (Stoic?) derivation of χειμών from χέω which is preserved in the Etymologicum Magnum.

In his discussion of Books VIII-X Dr. Dahlmann distinguishes the 'anomaly' of Chrysippus, which was primarily logical, from the use of the term by Crates in opposition to the 'analogy' of the Alexandrians. While the arrangement of Book VIII is based on Stoic doctrine, the anomalistic arguments put forward are those of Crates. Dr. Dahlmann thinks that here Varro was using a 'Latin follower of

Crates'; who this was he is naturally unable to suggest.

C. J. FORDYCE.

Jesus College, Oxford.

Die Erzählungstechnik von Apuleius' Metamorphosen und ihrer Vorlage. Von PAUL JUNGHANNS. Pp. vi + 184. (Philologus, Supplementband XXIV, Heft I.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1932. Paper, M. 11.50 (bound, 13.50).

THE value of this able study is impaired by the writer's lack of acquaintance not only with everything published since October 1928, when the work was completed, but also with some very important earlier things, especially Perry's Princeton dissertation of 1920 and his articles of 1925 and 1926. The treatise is divided into an 'analytic' and a 'synthetic' section, of which the first deals chiefly with the *Ovos*, the second chiefly with Apuleius. Junghanns insists that Photius meant what he seems to say, that the first two books of 'Lucius of Patrae' corresponded to the whole of the *Ovos*. He concludes that nine-tenths of the earlier work survives in the *Ovos*, whose writer merely omitted half a dozen episodes, and left the rest almost unchanged. The chief difficulty in this view is that, if the two versions were so nearly identical, it is hard to explain Photius's insistence on their difference in tone. Junghanns rejects Neukamm's view that Lucian wrote the *Ovos* and does not mention Perry's theory, that he wrote 'Lucius of Patrae'.

The study of Apuleius's own work is excellent, and does something to render intelligible the perennial charm of the *Metamorphoses* by demonstrating the consummate art with which he has refashioned his coarsely realistic model.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Die orientalischen Religionen im römischen Heidentum. Von FRANZ CUMONT. Nach der vierten französischen Auflage unter Zugrundlegung der Übersetzung Gehrichs bearbeitet von Dr. A. Burchardt-Brandenberg. Dritte Auflage. Pp. xvi + 334; 8 double plates. Leipzig: Teubner, 1931. Bound, Rm. 14 (unbound, 12).

CUMONT's *Religiones orientales* has been with us for a quarter of a century, and requires neither description nor appraisal. Suffice it to say that this handsomely produced edition is based on the enlarged French edition of 1928, and that the notes incorporate fresh material supplied by Professor Cumont to the translator in the spring of 1930.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

St. Basil: The Letters. With an English translation by ROY J. DEFERRARI. Vol. III. Pp. xv + 489. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1930. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

THIS volume includes the three 'canonical' letters, and Professor Deferrari has provided them with a useful commentary, which ought,

however, to have taken account of the striking results of recent epigraphical work both on the Orthodox Church and on the heretical churches of Lycaonia. The same lack of interest in any work on Basil other than that of later Fathers and more modern theologians has misled Professor Deferrari into foisting false forms like *Οὐάροδα* and *Μητορεία* into the text (p. 40). He still makes mistakes of translation: e.g. (p. 46) *καὶ κτένες, καὶ τὰ ὀστροκόρινα πάντα, ὧν οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἰχθύς, καὶ πάντα ἃ διαπορεύεται τρίβους θαλασσῶν*, 'cockles and all testaceous animals, none of which are fish, and they are all creatures that traverse the paths of the sea'; (p. 120) *ἀπαξ δὲ ὁ ὅρκος ἀπηγγόρευται· πολλὰ δὲ δῆπου εἰκὸς τὸν ἐπὶ κακῷ γινόμενον κατακεκρίσθαι*. 'But the oath has been altogether forbidden, and of course it is much more reasonable that whoever is ordained to evil be condemned'—sound doctrine, no doubt, but the subject under discussion is the oath taken to do wrong. These two examples are not isolated, and there are many misprints. In a notice of a former volume (C.R. XLI, p. 150) I protested—on aesthetic grounds—against the use of the Douay version as a vehicle for scriptural quotation in the Loeb Series. Professor Deferrari remains unrepentant; and now we get (p. 119; cf. p. 125 and *passim*) 'cf. Tim. 4. 4: ὅτι πᾶν κτίσμα Θεοῦ καλόν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον, μετὰ εὐχαριστίας τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ ἐπεγνωκῶσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν'. 'For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be rejected that is received with thanksgiving.' The Douay version is evidently based on a different text' (my italics). Evidently; but why not at least print the well-known Greek text which corresponds to the Douay version?

With all this deduction there remains a balance of solid and useful work for which we are grateful to Professor Deferrari.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

A Concordance of Prudentius. By ROY JOSEPH DEFERRARI and JAMES MARSHALL CAMPBELL. Pp. ix + 833. Cambridge (Mass.): The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1932. Heavy paper, \$12.50.

NOW that we have in J. Bergman's edition of Prudentius (Vienna, 1926) a text of Prudentius about as near perfection as possible, the time is opportune for the publication of a concordance to the works of this, the prince of Latin Christian poets. He was so steeped in the classical tradition that his work cannot be a matter of indifference to any student of Latin poetry. With the advice of Professor Lane Cooper of Cornell, that great maker of concordances, two well-known professors of the Catholic University of America have produced this admirable work with the help of a number of their pupils. I have tested it in a number of places, and have been unable to discover a single error.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

Serapion of Thmuis against the Manichees. By R. P. CASEY, Ph.D., Professor of the History of Religions, Cincinnati. Pp. 80. (Harvard Theological Studies, XV. Issued as an extra number of the *Harvard Theological Review*.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1931. Paper, 8s. 6d.

STUDENTS of primitive Liturgies need no introduction to Serapion; this is a longer (Dr. Casey thinks an earlier) work by the author of the Sacramentary. Stylistic comparison leaves little doubt that, as has long been suspected, the latter is a compilation, not an original composition, by Serapion. The treatise shows the mind of a well-educated Greek theologian of a philosophic and dialectical piety rather than a mystic. It adds very little to our knowledge of Manicheism, of which, indeed, Serapion had no deep understanding if Burkitt's and Schaefer's reconstructions are trustworthy. But it was worth editing, if only to show in what a haphazard way an active supporter of Athanasius could use terms like *obolía* and *ὑπόστασις* in the heat of the Arian controversy. Cap. XI. contains an early and interesting example of the veneration of relics, and there is ground for believing that Serapion's gospel canon reversed the order of Matthew and Mark. The editing and introduction are excellent, particularly the section on the relation of this document to other *Serapionica*.

GREGORY DIX, O.S.B.

The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt. By EDWARD ROCHIE HARDY, Jr., Ph.D. Pp. 162; 1 plate, 1 map. (Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, No. 354.) New York: Columbia University Press (London: P. S. King), 1931. Cloth, \$3.00 or 15s.

A DETAILED study of the semi-feudal estates of Byzantine Egypt, which should do for them what Gelzer and Rouillard have done for the state administration of Egypt, has long been an urgent need. In the present volume this need has been most satisfactorily supplied. It is an excellent study of the abundant but by no means always very tractable material, thorough, critical, and intelligent, and will put all Byzantinists much in the author's debt. The evidence, plentiful though it may be, is often ambiguous, for much of it comes from accounts whose brief entries are capable of more than one interpretation, and on particular points Dr. Hardy's statements may require modification, but the general picture he gives of the machinery and economic life of these great estates is undoubtedly correct. Much of his material is to be found in the papers of that great family of Oxyrhynchus whose successive heads were called alternately Apion and Strategius; and it is pleasant to find for frontispiece a reproduction of the consular diptych of Apion II., consul ordinarius in A.D. 539.

The printing is not as careful as it might be. The Greek type used is poor and sometimes badly inked, and misprints are not uncommon. Most are obvious, but a few may give trouble,

e.g. 'volumn' for 'column' (p. 30, l. 14), 'who for 'whole' (p. 52, l. 7), 'RI.' for 'R(ecto)' (p. 82, note 4), 'of' for 'in' (p. 87, l. 7), 'months' for 'mounts' (p. 106, l. 5 from bottom), '900' for '922' (p. 108, note 3), '332' for '215' (p. 113, note 1), 'brought' for 'bought' (p. 120, l. 2 from bottom).

British Museum.

H. I. BELL.

Beiträge zur Syntax der spätgriechischen Volkssprache. Von HERMAN LJUNGVIK. Pp. vii+110. (Skrifter utgivna av K. Humanistika Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala, 27: 3. Uppsala: Almqvist och Wiksell. Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1932. Paper, kr. 4.

EVERYTHING which tends to bridge the gulf between ancient and modern Greek is to be welcomed, and here we have a study of certain constructions in popular Greek drawn mainly from the papyri; we see how early in popular spoken Greek the germs of the modern syntax were formed. The usefulness of the papyri makes it all the more to be regretted that after they fail we have no such store of vulgar Greek until quite modern times: there is nothing Byzantine to answer to them. But if there must be a break in the history of Greek, let it be as narrow as possible. Brevity compels us to omit details. But on p. 1 the use of the double article where the adjective precedes should not be attributed to the *Volkssprache* in general: the author's own reference to Anagnostopoulos shows that it is hardly found outside Pontos and some parts of northern Greece. At the end of the book the remarks on the relation of the loss of the infinitive to the paratactic constructions of popular speech are very interesting.

R. M. DAWKINS.

Exeter College, Oxford.

Name und Nationalität der Germanen. Von GUSTAV STÜMPPEL. Pp. iv+75. (*Klio*, Beiheft XXV., neue Folge, Heft XII.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1932. Paper, M. 4.50; bound, 6.

THE *Germani* were Celts. This conclusion and incidental confirmation of Poseidonios (Strabo IV. 195 f. and VII. 290) is reached, very briefly, as follows: Admittedly Celtic double-names—of tribes, e.g. Volcae-Tectosages and Volcae-Arecomici—are found from Spain to Noricum, and especially in Gaul; following this premise, the author next interprets Caes. *B.G.* II. 4, 10, *Condrusos, Eburones, Caerosos, Paemanos, qui uno nomine Germani appellantur*, as affording a further example of the same ethnical type—here *Germani* is the common name of this Celtic tribal union (=Germani Condrusi, Germani Eburones, etc.) and is therefore a Celtic proper name. This name *Germani* (for its 'reine Keltizität' see also *Phil. Woch.*, 1928, 24, Sp. 749 ff.) later in Caesar's *Excursus* (*B.G.* VI. 21-24), losing its purely ethnical content, acquired a wholly new geographical meaning; to which Tacitus (*Germ.* I. 4) attached a fresh and false national connotation. But the original *Germani* were Celts. The

main argument, as briefly outlined, is, throughout this attractive thesis, very elaborately supported.

A. N. NEWELL.

University of Manchester.

Ce que Rome et l'Empire Romain doivent à la Gaule. By JÉRÔME CARCOPINO. Pp. 36. (The Zaharoff Lecture.) Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1932. Paper, 2s. net.

M. CARCOPINO admirably surveys the contribution of Gaul to the military and political development; the material civilisation; and the art, religion and literature of the Roman Empire. We welcome in this last section the importance attached to the survival of a native Celtic style in Gallo-Roman sculpture; while the discussion of Druids and Pythagoreans prepares us for the final and supreme statement that *Aeneid* VI. is 'construit sur un thème populaire gaulois'—the gathering of the Golden Bough of mistletoe. (See Pliny, *H.N.* XVI. 249.)

A. N. NEWELL.

University of Manchester.

Roman Britain. By R. G. COLLINGWOOD. Pp. xii+160; 59 figures, including plates, and map. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932. Cloth, 6s.

The Romans in Britain. An Anthology of Inscriptions. With translations and a running commentary. By A. R. BURN. Pp. 228; 4 plates. Oxford: Blackwell, 1932. Cloth, 6s. MR. COLLINGWOOD's essay on Roman Britain, as it originally appeared in *The World's Manuals*, was a first-rate study which immediately took its place in the lamentably limited group of works on the subject which are really good. In its revised form the essay is, if that is possible, even better. To students of the subject it will be provocative; to those whose knowledge is elementary it will serve as a most illuminating guide.

The Romans in Britain falls irrevocably into another and larger category. It is difficult to see for what class of reader this book is intended, still more difficult to see what readers will benefit from its perusal. Sentiment apart, it is not desirable that beginners in Roman epigraphy should commence with the study of Romano-British stones, and it gives a false emphasis to the importance of inscriptions generally in Romano-British studies if an attempt is made to hang the history of the province primarily upon the stones which have survived.

The major question of the concept and purpose of the book outweighs all questions of execution. The author would however be well advised to read or reread what Mr. Collingwood has said on nationalism and on Roman culture generally.

The author remarks upon the sense of humour revealed by certain Latin authors. Remarks might well be made upon his own.

J. A. PETCH.

Akzent und Diphthongierung. Von ALFRED SCHMITT. Heidelberg: Winter, 1931. Pp. vii+137. Paper, M. 4.50.

THIS book consists of two parts. In the first (pp. 1-59) Dr. Schmitt discusses the nature of 'accent' in general, which he defines as 'Energiemaximum.' The expenditure of energy may show itself in two ways, as a raising of the tone of the voice or as a greater intensity of expiration. In a previous work, *Untersuchungen zur allgemeinen Akzentlehre*, the author has emphasised the necessity for distinguishing between an accent which consists simply in a raising or lowering of the musical tone and an accent which serves as the rhythmical centre of the word or phrase. Here he develops this thesis. The example of Chinese is especially instructive. As all know, Chinese has a purely musical tone or system of tones, which serve, not as the rhythmical centre of the word or word-group, but purely in a grammatical function, since differences of tone distinguish words from each other which would otherwise be identical. What is not so generally known is that a stress accent forms the centre of a group of monosyllabic words (each with its own tone), and binds them together as a single phonetic whole, which expresses often a single concept. But it does not necessarily follow that every language must have an accent serving as a rhythmical centre; and those who maintain the complete absence of rhythmical character in the Indo-European accent will not follow the author in assuming that the accent of Greek corresponded in function to the centralising stress accent of Chinese word-groups. But even if not agreeable to all schools of thought, Dr. Schmitt's points are clearly put, and should give rise to fruitful reflection.

In the second part (p. 60 ff.) the author's conclusions as to the connection between accentuation and diphthongisation are interesting. It is not the purely grammatical musical tone, but the centralising stress accent, which has led to the splitting of simple vowels into diphthongs, for it has produced differences of tension within the accented syllable itself. Thus Romance and Germanic, which developed a strongly stressed syllable, serving as the centre of the word, both show this tendency to diphthongise the vowel of the stressed syllable. On the other hand, languages which had no centralising accent, such as ancient Greek or Sanskrit, do not have this tendency. None of the descendants of Sanskrit has developed a strong centralising accent, and none shows the phenomenon of diphthongisation. Dr. Schmitt has done linguists a service not only in bringing out the fact of this development, but also in displaying the machinery of its working. It will be desirable to examine other languages for confirmation of Dr. Schmitt's theory and for possible further developments of it. Already Meillet in a review of this same work has drawn attention to the fact that diphthongisation occurs in certain Slavonic languages.

R. L. TURNER.

*School of Oriental Studies,
London.*

Esquisse d'une Histoire de la Langue latine.

Par A. MEILLET. Second edition. Pp. xiii+298. Paris: Hachette, 1931. Paper, 25 fr.

IN a review of the first edition of this work I ventured to express the opinion that it should be in the hands of all students and teachers of Latin, whether professed comparative philologists or not. That has proved the general view, for in the preface to this second edition the author regrets that the speed at which the first has been disposed of has prevented him from making all the alterations he would have made had he had more time. Nevertheless, besides numerous changes of detail, he has appended eight pages containing observations of great general importance for the comparative chronology of the Indo-European languages. These have a particular bearing on the conception of an Italo-Keltic unity. In a linguistic area the central mass of contiguous dialects tends to develop innovations in common, so that they will show both common conservations and common innovations. Among the widely separated languages of the circumference the innovations will tend to be divergent, so that the similarity of the outer languages will consist in common conservations only. This is a doctrine which I have long taught with regard to the Indo-Aryan languages, where, to take but one example, the central group show the innovation *-m- > -v-*, while at the circumference the dialects of the Hindu Kush in the North-West and Singhalese in the far South preserve *-m-* unchanged. So Meillet points out that Latin, like other languages of the circumference, preserves old features of Indo-European. To take but two of his examples: the perfect ending *-ere*, of which no trace is found in the central languages such as Greek, Germanic, Baltic, Slavonic, corresponds to similar forms in Hittite, Tokharian, and Indo-Iranian. It is the Latin *ferens*, feminine as well as masculine, which, as in Hittite, shows in the participle the same lack of formal distinction between the two animate genders as in the substantive; Greek is the innovator with *φέρουσα*. Now the principal agreements between Italic and Keltic consist in the conservation of original Indo-European features, sometimes preserved by other outer languages too; the number of innovations made in common is small. The case, then, for a

particularly close or recent Italo-Keltic unity falls to the ground. R. L. TURNER.

*School of Oriental Studies,
London.*

Jules Africain: Fragments des Cestes provenant de la collection des tacticiens grecs.

Par J. R. VIEILLEFOND. Pp. lviii+96. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1932. Paper, 60 frs.

M. VIEILLEFOND deserves many thanks for editing those fragments of the *Kestoi* which profess to relate to military matters, for hitherto there has been no scientific or readable text available. His Introduction deals first with Africanus' life and with what remains of or is known about the *Kestoi*; he decides that the same man did write the *Chronography*, *Kestoi*, and *Letters*, and properly doubts his having been a military officer; the name *Kestoi* he connects with the cestus of Aphrodite and translates *Talismans* or *Amulets*. Next comes the history of the various extracts made from this work, and an account of the four principal MSS. and their relationships, with a list of the Renaissance copies; p. liii gives a clear summary of results. Incidentally it appears (p. xi) that the extracts from Aeneas Tacticus supposed to be taken from Africanus and so printed in Hunter's and the Loeb editions of Aeneas are not from Africanus but merely from the same MSS. There follows the Greek text, with critical apparatus: first, compilation A, twenty chapters, given by *Laurentianus*; secondly, compilation L, fourteen other chapters which, intermixed with A, are given in the other three (related) MSS.; lastly, the excerpts given in the *Tactica* of Pseudo-Leo and Pseudo-Constantine. There are three indexes. Greek tactical writers, except Aeneas, are dull, but Africanus is only dull occasionally; his queer farrago of sense and nonsense, history and tall stories, is often both attractive and interesting; he is important for the study of magic, and he gropes along a path which was to lead to poison gas and germ-carriers. Now that, thanks to M. Vieillefond, we have a good text, I hope that it will find many readers.

W. W. TARN.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

CLASSICAL WEEKLY XXV, 33-231.

NOVEMBER 9, 1931—May 23, 1932.

- 33, B. W. Mitchell, *Merlin and Macaroni* <cs>;
39, H. J. Rose, *Modern Methods in Classical Mythology*, reviewed (E. Riess); 41, E. A. Schnabel, *Little Latin and Less Greek*—on the position of Classics in American schools;
44, A. J. Butler, *Sport in Classic Times*, reviewed (A. D. Fraser); 49, T. W. Valen-

tine, *Effects of Climate on Roman History*; 54, E. K. Rand, *A Walk to Horace's Farm*, reviewed (J. W. Spaeth, Jr.); 65, T. W. Valentine, *Medieval Church and Vergil*; 68, *Princeton Papyri*, ed. A. C. Johnson and H. B. van Hoesen, reviewed (W. L. Westermann); 73, 81, E. G. Wilkins, *Classification of Ovid's Similes*; 86, D. R. MacIver, *Greek Cities in Italy and Sicily*, reviewed (C. Saunders); 89, N. W. DeWitt, *Virgil and Epicureanism*; 99, *Aeneid*, ed. J. W. Mackail,

reviewed (M. B. Ogle); 105, L. A. Post, *Ancient Memory Systems*; 121, 129, 139, F. A. Spencer, *Literary Lineage of Cupid*; 135, A. Walde's *Etymological Latin Dictionary*, 3rd edn. (by J. B. Hofmann), parts 1-4, reviewed (E. H. Sturtevant);

- 137, C. Knapp, *Professor Mackail's edition of the Aeneid*—on methods of reviewing, with extensive quotations from C. J. Fordyce's candid criticism of Mackail in *Oxford Magazine*; 145, D. B. Kaufman, *Roman Barbers*; 150, J. G. O'Neill, *Ancient Corinth, Part I* (up to 404 B.C.), reviewed (A. B. West); 159, Tenney Frank, *Life and Literature in the Roman Republic* (emphasising original elements in the literature), reviewed (J. Hammer); 153, 161, 169, E. Le V. Crum, *Diet in Ancient Medicine*; 175, E. N. Gardiner, *Athletics of Ancient World*, and C. A. Forbes, *Greek Physical Education*, reviewed (A. D. Fraser); 183, 200, 212, E. S. McCartney, *Classical Weather Lore of Thunder and Lightning*; 197, G. Showerman, *Rome and the Romans*, reviewed (A. D. Fraser); 209, R. T. Ohl, *Symphosius and the Latin Riddle*.

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT

(JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1932.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—*Héracrite d'Éphèse, doctrines philosophiques traduites intégralement et précédées d'une introduction* par M. Solovine [Paris, 1931, Alcan. Pp. xl+99] (Loew). Contains introduction, life of H., translation and notes. Reviewer has much to criticise.—*Aristote, Rhétoric (livre I)*, par M. Dufour [Paris, 1932, 'Les Belles Lettres'] (Gohlke). Text entirely dependent on Roemer's in Teubner series. Introduction too superficial to come to real grips with the various problems.—J. Humbert, *Polycrates, l'accusation de Socrate, et le Gorgias* [Paris, 1930, Klincksieck. Pp. 62] (Nestle). Takes up Gercke's theory that the Gorgias is Socrates' reply to Polycrates and attempts fresh corroboration. Many of H.'s observations are convincing and form an important contribution towards the solution of the Callicles problem.—T. Zielinski, *Iresione, Tomus I dissertationes ad comediam et tragoediam spectantes continens*, Eus suppl. 2 [Lwow, 1931. Pp. vii+468] (Morel). First of three volumes gathering together Z.'s opuscula. Volumes II and III are to contain publications on ancient religion and miscellanea. Volume I consists of eleven papers in German, English, French and Latin. Reviewer hopes many will enjoy these 'ripe fruits.'

LATIN LITERATURE.—*Cicéron, Tusculanes (I et II)*. Texte ét. par G. Fohlen et trad. par J. Humbert [Paris, 1931, 'Les Belles Lettres'] (Philippson). Engaging translation. Text and notes contain nothing new and are not always reliable.—*L. Annaei Senecae ad Lucilium epistulae morales, I, II*. Rec. A. Beltrami [Rome, 1931, Officina Polygraphica. Pp. xlv+424 and 313] (Hosius). Text mainly that of the first edition; critical notes

contain most of the conjectures since then. The contents are worthy of the splendid get-up.

HISTORY.—F. Granier, *Die makedonische Heeresversammlung. Ein Beitrag zum antiken Staatsrecht* [Munich, 1931, Beck. Pp. xiv+206] (Geyer). Copious and scattered material collected with great industry. Penetrating interpretation, but often carried too far.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—*Bilder griechischer Vasen*. Herausg. von J. D. Beazley und P. Jacobsthal. *Heft 1*: W. Hahland, *Vasen um Meidias*; *Heft 2*: J. D. Beazley, *Der Berliner Maler*; *Heft 3*: K. Schefold, *Kertscher Vasen*; *Heft 4*: J. D. Beazley, *Der Pan-Maler* [Berlin, Keller. Pp. 24, with 24 plates; 24, with 32 plates; 24, with 24 plates; 28, with 32 plates] (Diepolder). These volumes are the first of a new series intended to provide fresh material for research. By attempting to present the personality of Greek vase-painters they meet a requirement of modern study. A very happy idea.—J. Steinhäusen, *Archäologische Karte der Rheinprovinz. I, 1: Trier-Mettendorf*. —Dazu Textband: *Ortskunde Trier-Mettendorf*, Herausg. von der Gesellschaft für Rheinische Geschichtskunde [Bonn, 1932, Hanstein. Pp. 383, with 32 plates and 38 figures] (Gündel). First section of this gigantic archaeological map; exemplary production and very comprehensive. The volume of text is an indispensable work of reference arranged alphabetically.—T. Birt, *Die Schaubauten der Griechen und die attische Tragödie* [Berlin, 1931. Pp. viii+208] (Kraemer). Mine of information about Greek theatres and ancient drama. Like B.'s other books it combines profound learning and thorough mastery of subject with a most readable exposition. B. holds (rightly, in reviewer's opinion) in opposition to Dörpfeld that tragedy was performed ἐνί σκηνῇ and not in the orchestra.

LANGUAGE.—E. Williger, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu den Komposita der griechischen Dichter des 5. Jahrhunderts* [Göttingen, 1928. Pp. 60] (Kraemer). Important work containing wealth of material and dealing with an almost bewildering amount of detail. Shows wonderful mastery of subject.

PAPYROLOGY.—*Papyri Graecae magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*. Herausg. und übersetzt von K. Preisendanz. Bd. II unter Mitarbeit von E. Diehl, S. Eitrem, A. Jacoby [Leipzig, 1931, Teubner. Pp. xv+216, with 3 plates] (Pfister). Volume 2 is on approximately the same lines as volume 1. The GZP are among the most important texts published since the war. Reviewer discusses at some length.

Nos. 35 to 38 of the *Phil. Woch.* form a 'Festschrift zu Franz Polands fünfundsiebzigstem Geburtstag.' They contain 58 short original articles (mostly about four columns in length) dealing with a variety of subjects in the field of classical literature, epigraphy, palaeography, philology, history, philosophy, and art.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classica' studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

**. Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- Alexander** (W. H.) Notes and Emendations to the Epistulae Morales of L. Annaeus Seneca. Pp. 15. (Publications of the University of Alberta.) Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1932. Paper, 30 cents.
- Arnaldi** (F.) La Poesia dell' Iliade. Pp. 99. Bologna: Zanichelli, 1932. Paper, L.20.
- Barker** (E. P.) Seneca's Letters to Lucilius, translated by E. P. B. 2 volumes; pp. xxvi + 324, 334. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Bett** (H.) Some Secrets of Style. Pp. 277. London: Allen and Unwin, 1932. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Burton** (O. E.) A Study in Creative History. The interaction of the eastern and western peoples to 500 B.C. Pp. 320. London: Allen and Unwin, 1932. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Clendon** (A.) and **Vince** (J. H.) The Clarendon Latin Course. A four-year course for schools. Third and fourth years. Pp. 287. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Drerup** (E.) Die Schulaussprache des Griechischen. II. Teil: Vom XVIII. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart. (Studien zur Geschichte u. Kultur des Altertums, VII. Ergänzungsband.) Pp. viii, 489-1051. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1932. Paper, M.32.
- Festschrift zu Franz Polands fünfundsiebzigstem Geburtstag.** (Philologische Wochenschrift, 52. Jahrgang, No. 35/38.) Pp. 158. Leipzig: Reisland, 1932. Paper, M.3.60.
- Frank** (T.) Cicero. Pp. 26. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XVIII.) London: Milford, 1932. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.
- Frisk** (H.) Studien zur griechischen Wortstellung. Pp. 184. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift XXXIX. 1933 : 1.) Göteborg: Wettergren och Kerber, 1932. Paper, kr. 10.
- Gercke** (A.) und **Norden** (E.) Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft. 4. Auflage. II. Band, 1. Heft: Griechisches und römisches Privatleben, von E. Pernice; pp. 87. 2. Heft: Münzkunde, von K. Regling; pp. 37. 3. Heft: Griechische und römische Kunst, von A. Rumpf; pp. 106. III. Band, 3. Heft: Der griechische und der hellenistische Staat, von V. Ehrenberg; pp. 104. Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1932. Kartoniert, RM. 3.24, 1.80. 4.32, 5.0.
- Giusti** (A.) I Medici in Omero. Pp. 29. Estratto da 'Il R. Liceo-Ginnasio "C. Colombo" in Genova, nel triennio 1928-31.' Paper.
- James** (L.) Hints on Latin Prose. Folded card; 1 for 6d., 12 for 5s., 50 for 15s., 100 for 25s., post-free, from the author, Moyses, Five Ashes, Sussex.
- Jenkins** (E. B.) Index Verborum Terentianus. Pp. ix+187. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, \$2.50 (14s. 6d.).
- Jolowicz** (H. F.) Historical Introduction to the Study of Roman Law. Pp. xxi+545. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Kurrlmeyer** (C. M.) The Economy of Actors in Plautus. Pp. 103. (A Johns Hopkins University dissertation, printed in Austria.) Paper.
- Langlotz** (E.) Griechische Klassik. Ihr Wesen und ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart. Pp. 26; 14 illustrations. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932. Paper, M. 2.80.
- Lightfoot** of Durham. Memories and Appreciations Collected and Edited by G. R. Eden and F. C. Macdonald. Pp. xv+192; illustrations. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Nordström** (V.) Asklepios och Läkare-staven. Pp. 20. Helsingfors: Mercators Tryckeri, 1932. Paper, 17 F.M.
- Nygren** (A.) Agape and Eros. A study of the Christian idea of love. Authorised translation by A. G. Herbert. Pp. xx+187. London: S.P.C.K., 1932. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Richardson** (G. H.) Metro e Muziko. Essayo pri la rapsodi-arito. Pp. 12. Published by the author, 164 Rye Hill, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1932. Paper, 50 centimi.
- Rodd** (Sir R.) Rome of the Renaissance and To-day. Pp. x+304; illustrations. London: Macmillan, 1932. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Rohde** (G.) Die Bedeutung der Tempelgründungen im Staatsleben der Römer. Pp. 20. Marburg: Elwert, 1932. Paper, Rm. 1.25.
- Sinclair** (T. A.) Hesiod's Works and Days. Pp. lxvi+96. London: Macmillan, 1932. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Sturtevant** (E. H.) T. Macci Plauti Pseudolus, edited, with an introduction and notes. Pp. 122. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Turner** (D.) The Old Gods. Echoes from Lucretius and from Greek Lyrics and other sources. Pp. 63. London: Besant, 1932. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Union Académique Internationale.** Emploi des signes critiques, disposition de l'apparat, dans les éditions savantes de textes grecs et latins. Conseils et recommandations. Pp. 46. Paris: Champion, 1932. Paper.
- Yale Classical Studies.** Vol. III. Pp. 208; 11 plates, 1 map. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, 14s. 6d. net.

are sent for
published

rentianus.
iversity of
Milford),

on to the
5. Cam-
cloth, 21s.

of Actors
Hopkins
Austria.)

hr Wesen
egenwart.
rt: Kohl-

nd Appre-
R. Eden
; illustra-
ess, 1932.

re-staven.
Tryckeri,

dy of the
d transla-
87. Lon-

et. Esayo
lished by
stle-upon-

ance and
London:

pelgründ-
Pp. 20.
m. 1.25.
nd Days.
an, 1932.

'seudolus,
d notes.
University
Cloth,

oes from
and other
nt, 1932.

Emloi
l'apparat,
greco et
ons. Pp.
er.
Pp. 208;
ale Uni-
d), 1932.